THE THATCHER EPISODE.

A Concise Statement of the Facts in the Case.

INTERESTING LETTERS AND DOCUMENTS.

A REVIEW OF M. THATCHER'S CLAIMS, PLEAS AND ADMISSIONS.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.
DESERET NEWS PUBLISHING COMPANY.
1896.

THE THATCHER EPISODE.

A CONCISE STATEMENT OF THE FACTS IN THE CASE.

RECENT occurrences in the Church render it necessary to present, in a popular form, some of the reasons for the action taken by the Council of the Twelve Apostles in reference to one of their number. False reports have been circulated, the motives and purpose of the leaders of the Church in this matter have been impugned, and improper feelings have in consequence arisen in the breasts of uninformed people, which may prove injurious to many unless the facts in the case are brought forward for their enlightenment. Current publications do not reach all the homes of the Saints, particularly in places remote from Salt Lake City. This pamphlet is therefore prepared for general dissemination among the members of the Church, that they may not be in the dark concerning the step which the Quorum of the Twelve found it their duty to take, after much patience, forbearance and charity. Their duty to God and the Church was and should be held superior to personal feeling and regard for an individual. It was performed in sorrow, but with firmness, because the law of the Lord must be held far above the feelings of men.

At the General Conference held in the Tabernacle, Salt Lake City, April 6th, 1896, a Declaration of Principles was enunciated by the Authorities of the Church. It was signed by the First Presidency, ten of the Apostles, the Patriarch of the Church, the Seven Presidents of the Seventies, and the Presiding Bishopric. Elder Anthon H. Lund, one of the Apostles, was then in England presiding over the European Mission. After his return he also signed it, leaving but one of the Church authorities as a dissentient. The Church in Conference assembled adopted and ratified the Declaration by unanimous vote. It was subsequently accepted by the various Stakes and Wards of the Church by vote in their respective localities.

The name of Moses Thatcher was not presented as one of the General Authorities of the Church at the April Conference, because he was not and had not been for some time in harmony with his quorum and with the other Church Authorities. His refusal to sign the Declaration of Principles was an outward and visible sign and token of that lack of harmony. It was therefore deemed improper to present his name at the Conference to be sustained by the body of the Church, when he was not held in fellowship by his quorum.

At the General Conference held October 6th, 1896, Moses Thatcher was still out of harmony with the Authorities of the Church, and he still refused to accept the Declaration which had become fully embodied in the doctrine and discipline of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. His name therefore was still omitted from the list of the General Authorities of the Church, and it was deemed necessary, for the information of the Latter-day Saints, that some explanation should be made concerning his attitude and standing in relation to his own Quorum and the Church in general. President Wilford Woodruff, therefore, in Conference assembled, made the following remarks, on Monday afternoon, October 5th, 1896, in the Tabernacle in Salt Lake City:

PRESIDENT WILFORD WOODRUFF.

I did not intend to occupy any more time in this Conference, but there is a subject or two that I feel in duty bound to talk upon, and I hope the Saints will give me their prayers and faith, that I may be enabled to do my duty. In order to arrive at the principles and subject I wish to speak of, I feel disposed to deviate from my general course of testimony in some respects.

There are two powers on the earth and in the midst of the inhabitants of the earth—the power of God and the power of the devil. In our history we have had some very peculiar experiences. When God has had a people on the earth, it matters not in what age, Lucifer, the son of the morning, and the millions of fallen spirits that were cast out of heaven, have warred against God, against Christ, against the work of God, and against the people of God. And they are not backward in doing it in our day and generation. Whenever the Lord set His hand to perform any work, those powers labored to overthrow it. I have a little experience in this direction that I want to refer to. Many of you probably have read the history of the first proclamation of the Gospel in England, under the presidency of Heber C. Kimball, in 1837. Just previous to that I crossed Lake Ontario with a man by the name of Russell, from Canada into the United States. That man walked the steamer almost day and night, moaning and groaning. What was the matter? He had a class of spirits that stayed with him night and

day, distressing him. What he had done that they had power over him I do not know. When a man does his duty and keeps the commandments of God, those spirits have no power over him, although he may be distressed in a measure from their operation. This man went to England, and those spirits went with him. He was with the Apostles there, and while they were holding a conference there he was so troubled with those spirits that Brothers Heber C. Kimball and Orson Hyde and the brethren who were there laid hands upon him and cast those evil spirits out of him. When they left him they seized upon Brother Hyde, and he fell to the floor as though he had been knocked on the head with a club. Brother Kimball and the brethren immediately laid hands upon him, and the evil spirits left him. They then fell upon Brother Kimball and tried to overcome him. But the vision of his mind was open and he saw them in the room. They gnashed their teeth at him; but did they overcome him? Brother Kimball held the Apostleship and he stood at the head of that Mission, and God gave him power over those spirits, and they were rebuked and left him. This was the beginning of their labors there. In 1840, when the Apostles were sent to England, we had a similar experience. The history of my travels in Herefordshire, Gloucestershire and Worcestershire is published and known to the Church. After laboring there some eight months, Brothers Heber C. Kimball and George A. Smith invited me to go to London. You all know what kind of men Brothers Kimball and Smith were. They had power and brought a great many into the Church. We three went into the City of London to undertake to open doors in that great city. The first man who opened his doors to receive us was a man by the name of Morgan. The very day we entered that house it was filled with evil spirits, who sought to destroy us. We felt their power day after day. They did not particularly injure us at that time, but we knew they were with us. The incident that I am going to refer to now occurred after Brother Kimball returned to Manchester. Brother George A. Smith and myself were left there. We sat up one night till about 11 o'clock, talking about the Gospel of Christ, and then went to bed. The room in which we slept was small; there was about three and a half feet between our cots. Those spirits were gathered together in that room and sought to destroy us. They fell upon us with the determination to take our lives. The distress, the suffering and the horror that rested upon me I never experienced before nor since. While in this condition a spirit said to me, "Pray to the Lord." Well, a man in that kind of warfare, when he is choking almost to death, is in a peculiar position to pray. Nevertheless I went to praying with all the power I had. I knew we would die unless God opened some door for our deliverance, because we were being choked to death, and I prayed to the Lord, in the name of Jesus Christ, to preserve our lives. While I was praying, the door opened and three messengers entered, and the room was filled with light equal to the blazing light

of the sun at mid-day. Those messengers were all dressed in the robes of immortal beings. Who they were I know not. They laid hands upon me and my companion, and rebuked those evil powers, and we were saved. From that hour to this day, not only our lives were saved, but those powers were rebuked by the angels of God so that no Elder since has been tormented with them in London.

I name this because there is a principle in it. From the day that the Prophet Joseph Smith was called upon by the angel of God and the plates of the Book of Mormon given into his hands, these evil spirits labored for his death, and finally his blood was shed by the power of the devil. You know about that. It is before the heavens and the earth, and has got to be settled for. Those spirits are wherever the Saints of God are, and they will follow this up until He who holds the keys of death and hell binds that old serpent, sets a seal upon him, and shuts him up for a thousand years. These evil spirits are all around us. They follow every Elder of Israel at home and abroad. They tempt me; they tempt you, and will as long as we dwell in the flesh and they have their agency and power. Why? Because they know the Priesthood is here; they know the power of God is here; they know the authority is here to seal blessings upon the heads of the children of men, and to preach the Gospel to the nations of the earth, that they may be prepared for the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ. Knowing this, if they can get any power over you and me they will exercise it.

There has been some talk here about myself, and my counselors, and the Twelve Apostles, and the position we hold as leaders of the people. I have been in the Apostleship for fifty-seven years. I have been through all the apostasies in this Church, if I may be allowed to use that expression, from the day of the organization of the Twelve Apostles. On one occasion two Apostles came to me while I was in Kirtland, and told me that Joseph Smith was a fallen prophet, and that they wanted to put another man in his place—Oliver Cowdery. They wanted to know what I would do about it. Said I, "Every man that lifts his hand against the Prophet of God will go to hell, unless he repents of his sins." Well, about half of them did repent; the others did not, and they lost their crown and glory, and other men have taken their places.

My brethren and sisters, there is something pressing upon my mind that I want to say. We have arrived at a point here with regard to circumstances that it is my duty to take up as the President of the Church. The First Presidency and the Twelve Apostles were never more united as a body than they are today. Our spirits are united. We believe together, we work together, we pray together, and we believe in each other, because we are all trying to do the will of God. This is the case with all of us, with one exception. That exception is Brother Moses Thatcher. A great many people marvel and wonder why something is not done with him. Some have said we were afraid of Moses Thatcher. I am not afraid of Moses Thatcher,

nor of any other man who breathes the breath of life, when it comes to a matter of duty. But I am afraid to disobey God, or to not perform my duty in any position that I am called to in the Church. There has been a great deal said with regard to Brother Moses Thatcher, and many have wondered why something was not done about him. Well, I will say that this is a matter that belongs to the Twelve Apostles. He is a member of that quorum, and of course it is their duty to take hold of that work and attend to it until it is settled. But I have felt, as the President of the Church, it is my duty to not let this conference pass without saying something upon this subject. Brother Moses Thatcher has been a very sick man. Preparations have been made by the Twelve Apostles to settle this difficulty with him in council; but he has been in the condition I speak of. What is the difficulty with Brother Thatcher? The difficulty is, he has not been with his quorum in spirit for years. He has not been united with them hardly, I may say, since the death of President Taylor. It is not his declining to sign this Declaration of Principles that was brought up at the last conference by the leaders of Israel. This is a matter of comparatively small consequence. I say here—and I say the truth—Brother Thatcher has not been in fellowship with us for a series of years. He has not met with his quorum. He has spent days and days in this city, when he was perfectly able to go about and do business, and has not met with them—neither at their sacrament meetings nor other meetings. Now, this cannot remain in this way. As I have said, these evil spirits affect men. There is a spirit affecting him, and not a good spirit either. With regard to his standing with his quorum, he should have met with them and talked these things over; but he has not done it. He has met with them comparatively few times since President Taylor's death.

Brethren and sisters, these are truths. The Apostles know that he has neglected to meet with them at times when he could and should have done so. He has been at difference with them in many things that have transpired. He has been by himself in his labor, and for himself, and not for the Church. Now, I want to say that neither Moses Thatcher nor any other man on the face of the earth can stand in the way of this Church. We have had almost whole quorums of Apostles that have been in the road, and they have had to be moved out of it, because the kingdom of God cannot stop for anybody—for Wilford Woodruff, for Moses Thatcher, or for anybody else. Unless we work with the Saints of God, with the Priesthood of God and with the organization of His Church, we cannot have any power or influence. I make this testimony because it is my duty. I have thought a great deal of Moses Thatcher. I had a good deal to do with his coming into the quorum of the Apostles. I had a great respect for his family. I have for any man that will bear his testimouy to the Gospel and kingdom of God. But he has stopped that. He has taken a different course with regard to this, and he occupies that position today. I name this because he is not in a condition to be tried.

The Lord's kingdom is going to roll on. If I took a stand against my counselors and against the Twelve Apostles, and we were not united together, I could not go with them. But the Lord is with us, and with His people. Whatever is required at our hands we want to perform it. I hope that the little time we spend here in the flesh, before we go into the valley of the shadow of death, we will pursue a course wherein we will be satisfied when we come to meet the Lord, and Joseph Smith, and the patriarchs and prophets. We will meet these people in the morning of the first resurrection. Many of them have got their resurrected bodies, and those who have not will have their bodies raised from the grave in an immortal condition. Who can sacrifice eternal life, and a part in the first resurrection, to stand with their wives and children in celestial glory, for the honor of this life or to gratify ambition? I cannot afford to do it, neither can you. We will hail Brother Moses Thatcher with every sentiment of our hearts when he will meet with us, unite with us, repent of his wrongdoings, and help carry on the work of God as he should do. Without this, he cannot go with us.

God bless you. I bear testimony to the heavens and the earth that this is the church and kingdom of God. We have got to live our religion and to be united in order to bear off the kingdom and receive those blessings that lie on the other side of the veil for us. I pray that His blessing and spirit may rest, not only on the First Presidency and Apostles and the whole Priesthood and the Saints, but upon Moses Thatcher, that his eyes may be opened to see, his ears to hear, and his heart to comprehend his position and duty before God and man.

The remarks of President Woodruff were listened to with the profoundest attention, as were the following remarks by succeeding speakers. President Snow's address is given in full, and such portions of the discourses that followed as relate to this subject are also given as officially reported:

PRESIDENT LORENZO SNOW.

As the President of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, of which Brother Thatcher is a member, I want to say a few words in connection with this subject that has been introduced by President Woodruff. I feel it my duty, however unpleasant that duty may be to me, to testify to the truth of what President Woodruff has said in reference to the fellowship existing between Brother Thatcher and our quorum. I think it was seven years ago when the present Presidency of the Church was organized, and I then was appointed to preside over the Quorum of the Apostles— a duty and an obligation that I felt the utmost incompetency to discharge; and yet believing and knowing that it was my duty to accept that position, I was satisfied that the Lord would aid and assist me in accomplishing the duties pertaining to that sacred office. I have labored actively from that day to the present to

do that which I considered my duty, to accomplish a perfect union between every member of that quorum, and a perfect union also with the First Presidency. I felt the importance of this when I took the position as President of the Twelve, and I asked the Lord to let me live until these duties were accomplished—until I could see and feel that every member of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles was in perfect fellowship with each other and with the First Presidency. The brethren of the Twelve can answer now whether that has been accomplished, and how far it has failed. It has failed in only one single instance, and that has been presented to you by President Woodruff. There are now of the Quorum of the Twelve ten members sitting here upon these stands. With these ten brethren there is now a perfect union between themselves and the First Presidency.

I distinctly remember a peculiar circumstance in connection with this subject. It was when perhaps 150 brethren were assembled in the upper hall of the Temple. The object of that assembling was to gather means to accomplish the completion of the Temple, and that speedily. I do not remember now how much we raised there, but it was a large sum, contributed by the brethren present. On that occasion President George Q. Cannon arose and spoke very feelingly in reference to the perfect union that then existed with the First Presidency, (this was about one year before the dedication of the Temple), in all matters pertaining to the interest of the Church, both spiritual and financial. After he got through, I dare say that the people there —I thought so, at least—expected that I would arise and say something in reference to the union of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles. I did not do it. I sat there in silence. And I never explained the reason to the Quorum of the Twelve, that I have any remembrance of, why I sat there in silence. I am now going to explain it. I thought my brethren had reasons to expect that I would arise and speak in reference to union. I could have spoken as loudly and as effectively in reference to the union of our quorum as Brother Cannon in reference to the union of the First Presidency, with but one single exception. That exception, I regret to say, was Brother Moses Thatcher. The brethren of the quorum will now understand why I sat there in silence.

The next day, I think it was, in going up to Brigham City on the train, Brother Thatcher and I sat together. I there told him this circumstance that I have just told you. I said to him that it was on his account—the love and respect that I had for him—that I did not arise and make him an exception. I would have been compelled at that time to have mentioned Brother Moses Thatcher as an exception. There were eleven of us that were in perfect union, which we had labored and toiled to effect completely and strongly and abundantly. But I would not place him in an unpleasant attitude before the people. I explained this to him.

But that was not the only time. The night previous to the dedication of the Temple we felt that the Quorum of the Twelve ought all

to be united, or perhaps there would be something arise that would prove of a disagreeable character. We called the quorum together. Every member was present. We labored and toiled at that meeting to bring Brother Thatcher into a union with us, hour after hour, till about two o'clock in the morning. I labored diligently. I always thought a good deal of Brother Thatcher. He and I always got along lovingly together; and he knows and will state it if he ever comes to address the people, that Brother Snow was one of his particular friends and felt an interest for him as deep as any man in the quorum. We labored there with only one object in view—to bring one member of our quorum into a perfect union with ourselves and with the First Presidency. At last I repeated to Brother Thatcher what I have been telling you. I told him of the sacrifice I made in my feelings when I had to keep silence, and I said I could not do it any more; I should be obliged to get up before the gathering in the Temple and state that our quorum was in perfect union—that is, if the subject came up, which it probably would—except in the case of Brother Thatcher. Well, we patched the thing up, and he came to a conclusion that we accepted at that time. How far that was really a conclusion made in his heart, I am not prepared to say.

There was another time, perhaps a year or a year and a half ago, when we sought to effect a union with Brother Thatcher and the quorum. We had a pretty difficult time, and failed. None of us felt satisfied.

About the last conversation I had with Brother Thatcher was in the Temple, either at the last spring or fall conference. We had prayed for him, and we had sent some of our most experienced brethren to talk with him privately and beg of him to make things satisfactory. I called on Brother Brigham Young, because I knew he felt an interest in Brother Thatcher, and was a wise man, to go and see him and plead with him to make things satisfactory. But he failed. He came and reported to me that a spirit of darkness seemed to reign in Brother Thatcher's heart, and he could not reach it. I still thought, however, that he would come and make things right before he returned to his home in Logan; and about the second or third day after this, I was visited by him in the Temple. I never felt to rejoice more in my heart than when I saw him enter my room. I thought he had made up his mind to do that which we requested him to do and to place himself in perfect fellowship with the brethren of the quorum. I talked with him. I did most of the talking myself. I felt the spirit of it, as I always did when I spoke to him, because my heart was warm towards him, and the Lord seemed to help me so that I felt perfectly at home in telling him just what the Lord dictated to me. On a previous occasion in the Temple, I laid my hands upon his head, according to his request and my own feelings, and blessed him. My heart went out for him. But I could not fellowshp Brother Thatcher, although I loved him. Did I love that man? No man, it seems to me, could love another man more than I

loved Brother Thatcher; and I labored for him, toiled for him, and prayed for him, and still shall do. I have not given up my hopes, and I will not give them up. My principle has ever been, when called upon to administer to the sick, who were perhaps at the point of death, without seemingly any hope whatever, to not give them up until I saw they were actually dead. So I am with Brother Thatcher, whose voice has been heard from this stand time after time, and we have loved to listen to his beautiful and inspiring words. But he is a different man now altogether—different in spirit, and of course, his physical condition is very bad, although I understand now, he is improving very rapidly. President Woodruff has explained to you the reason why we have not had him before our quorum and the matter investigated. His low physical condition is the reason. But, as I was saying, I thought he had come to my room with his mind made up to take a course to come into fellowship with his quorum. I was disappointed, however, I felt like shedding tears when he left the room. There was not that disposition existing in him that I hoped there would be when he came.

Now, there is a certain document that you have heard talked about a good deal. Brother Young and myself took that document to Brother Thatcher. His physical condition was not very promising, and I asked him if I should read it to him. He said he preferred to read it himself, and he read it—read it very deliberately. He said he did not feel then to approve of it altogether; he wished it to remain for awhile. We accorded him his wish. As President Woodruff had said, not half the trouble is in relation to that document—not one-hundredth part that is talked about. Of course, it was rather singular. There were appended to that document the names of the First Presidency, of the Apostles, (with the exception of Brother Lund, who was then in England) of the First Seven Presidents of the Seventies, of the Patriarchs, and of the presiding Bishopric—twenty-four names in all, representing the Authorities of the Church; but he did not feel inclined, he said, to put his name to the document.

I am reminded of a little anecdote I heard of Brother Erastus Snow, which illustrates a principle. Brother George A. Smith was speaking to an "outside" audience one night, and Brother Erastus fell asleep. When he got through preaching he sat down and elbowed Brother Erastus, and requested him to bear his testimony. It was thought that Brother Erastus had scarcely heard a word; but he arose and said, "My friends, every word that my brother here has said is God's truth." Now, why did he say so? There was a reason for this. Why, he knew Brother George A. Smith; he had heard him preach a hundred times, and he knew that he was a man of inspiration, and that he would never say anything but what was true. Well, I think when a man is so well acquainted with the First Presidency, with the Apostles, with the Patriarchs, with the Presidents of Seventies, and with the Presiding Bishops, he ought to have some confidence in the position of these brethren; and if that brother is rather low in his

mind and does not really feel competent to judge of the matter, he ought to have confidence in his brethren. Still, this matter does not amount to very much anyway. It is the general tenor of the course that Brother Thatcher has been pursuing since even before the organization of this First Presidency or before I was called to be the President of the Quorum of the Twelve. Many other things might be said, but I do not want to occupy the time.

Brethren and sisters, these are solemn truths that I have told you and what President Woodruff has stated. I want you all to pray for Brother Thatcher. As soon as his physical abilities will allow, we shall have him before our quorum, and he will be treated by his friends. But there are certain rules and regulations that we, as the servants of God, must conform to, and we are not responsible for them.

ELDER JOHN HENRY SMITH.

My brethren and sisters, this meeting is one of the sorrowful meetings in my experience. I have recognized the fact that there must be an explanation made to the Latter-day Saints in connection with the subject upon which the President of the Church and the President of the Council of the Apostles have treated. I fully understand that within three days after Brother Moses Thatcher declined to sustain his associates he would have been dealt with for his fellowship and standing in the Council of the Apostles but for his physical condition. All have felt exceedingly tender, recognizing the fact that he had been suffering for some time under conditions most unpleasant to himself. I am fearful that the Saints this afternoon have not fully heard the remarks that have been made by President Woodruff and President Snow. They have sought to explain to the understanding of this audience the condition that has arisen in this inner circle of the Church, that they might be free in the minds of the Saints from the charge, by the Saints, of fearfulness as to the correctness of the position that they have assumed, and ot the rightfulness of the position that Brother Thatcher has taken. I believe, however, that the Latter-day Saints as a whole, have read with certainty, through the influence of the Spirit, the correctness of the position taken by the Presidency of the Church as well as the other councils that have been united with them, and I trust that the understanding will be received by those who are here today and heard the remarks of the brethren, and by those who could not catch their words the spirit in which those utterances were given.

The Presidency of the Church and the Council of the Apostles, in their deliberations upon all questions that affect the well-being and interest of the cause, are as candid and frank in their consultations and expression of views as any body of men could possibly be. But when a conclusion has been reached as to the course that should be pursued, it is expected that every man will give in his adherence to the course marked out, and with unfaltering voice and fixed determination, so that those counsels may prevail, so far as may be pos-

sible, among the whole people. This feeling and sentiment has been expressed in telling language by President Woodruff and by President Lorenzo Snow; and I believe that every one of the Council of the Apostles, with the First Presidency, would make a similar expression of views upon this matter, were they to speak upon this subject.

It is not my thought, in the time that I am here, to dwell upon the position in which our brother finds himself. I have held the hope, I hold the hope now, that he will see his way clear to put himself in unison with his associates, that he may stand with them and receive in the end the commendation of our Father, through his humility, and that his name may not be effaced from the roll of honor which God in this dispensation and in this day has established. It is not for me to speak further upon this subject. I stand by my President and by the Presidency of this Church in the position they have taken, because I know they are right. It is not a question of fear or doubt in my mind. It may be—and I presume my brethren will bear me out in this—that I have been slower than any of them to form judgment or pass an opinion in regard to this situation as it is today. But it has not been because there was the least doubt or question in my mind of the correctness of the position that they had taken. My judgment was convinced that their position was absolutely correct, or I never would have subscribed my name to that document, nor would I, in connection with my brethren, have sought in various ways to awaken a class of reflections in the mind of our brother that would have brought him in unison with the council of which he is a member. My position has been such that I have felt the extremest delicacy, in every place and under every circumstance, in giving expression to anything that could in any sense reflect uoon him. For this reason, if no other, in the midst of the deliberations of my own council, with that of the Presidency of the Church, I have felt extremely guarded, seeking to gain as much time as practicable in his interest, trusting that the time would come when the Almighty would touch his heart and he would feel the spirit of kindness that has welled up in the soul of President Woodruff, that has guided his Counselors, and that has been the characteristic in every deliberation of President Snow in seeking to preserve one who was dear to us all. But there can be no question in the minds of the Latter-day Saints. There may come a time in all our lives when perchance, amid the temptations and allurements of ambition, our hope and fears for ourselves may be aroused; but in our sober senses and in the midst of experiences of this life, the men who have received the Apostleship, who have been chosen by God Himself to be witnesses to His Son, must find themselves in that position that they indeed listen to the still small voice and recognize the power which God Himself has established. I feel that this has been and is the position of that circle in which I move; and the unfortunate circumstances which have attended one of

their associates in connection with this matter, is to me indeed a matter of extreme regret. I have prayed, I have plead, I have done everything so far as lay in my power in connection with these circumstances, trusting that our Father might so move upon the heart of our brother that he would meet his brethren with a broken heart and a contrite spirit and say, "I am with you heart and soul."

During this Conference, my brethren and sisters, the spirit of inspiration resting upon the brethren has been, "give ear to the legitimate and proper counsels of the Priesthood." I presume there are none of us who have made a study of the organization that our Father has established that can question the wisdom of those counsels. the people are to be united, it must be upon the basis that their hearts are in attune with the propositions upon which they would be united. We believe that God in this dispensation has restored the Gospel; that the Father and the Son came to the Prophet and bestowed upon him the knowledge that God did indeed live, and that Jesus Christ was indeed His Son; that all the keys, powers and authorities necessary to the accomplishment of His work, and that were exercised in former dispensations, were given to him; and that in all these things and in the organization of His Church, He presented us a complete and perfect pattern, that union might be the result of their counsels and their action. We note the conditions of that organization in all its bearings, and when one of the cogs in this machine that God himself has established shall fail to be in attune with the balance of that machine, the results are manifest in the spirits of the people; for they read, and read understandingly under the influence of that Spirit, that these conditions do exist and that the machinery is not working as it should. Therefore we, recognizing the purpose and design of our Father in the completeness of that organization, keep in view the movements and actions of the men at the head, the spirit of their counsel and instruction, and we readily detect, while words may not speak it, the spirit of insubordination or a determination to not carry out and fulfill the obligations which our Father has placed upon His children; and recognizing this, a spirit of uncertainty, of fear and of doubt takes possession of many men whose minds are susceptible to that influence.

I trust that the spirit of the work shall indeed ever be with the Latter-day Saints; that the movements that are made, the efforts that are brought to pass to secure the best interests of the work and of its spread in the world, shall be written in the hearts of the people of God; and if they will attend to their prayers and fulfill their obligations, our Father will never allow one of them to drift from the path of rectitude and fail to maintain the honor and credit of His cause in the world. But if perchance a spirit shall take possession of us that we seek to avoid the responsibilities that may attach to us, and we desire the encomiums and the laudations of men, we may find ourselves carried away with our ambitions, and catching our foot upon the ap-

plause of our fellows, will trip and fall and will not be found carrying the standard and proclaiming the truth as we should in the presence of all men.

I desire to bear my testimony to the truth of the work of God. I did not live in the flesh to know Joseph Smith. I did not live in the flesh to converse with him. The line, I presume, is broken when you reach me in the Council of the Apostles, as to those who knew him. But I am here as much of a witness of his mission as my brethren who saw him in the flesh. God gave me the knowledge of his mission. He also gave me the acquaintance of Brigham Young in the flesh, whom He raised up as well as the Prophet Joseph, to plant the standard of eternal truth in these mountains and to be a savior to this people whom he led into the desert, taught the ways of husbandry and the responsibilities and duties of the people of God. May the spirit of that Gospel well up in our hearts, and the knowledge that God lives, that Jesus is the Christ, that Joseph Smith was His prophet, that John Taylor was His prophet, that Wilford Woodruff is his prophet, live in our hearts, and grow and spread until we shall scatter that knowledge to the ends of the earth and all mankind know of its truth.

ELDER BRIGHAM YOUNG.

I have a desire to say a few words on this occasion, and I trust that the same spirit of kindness will be in my heart that has been manifested by the brethren who have spoken. I am sure I feel very kind and lenient and feel to extend mercy to my brethren, as I ask for mercy from my God. There was a time when I was absent from Utah for two years and a half. I left here in August, 1890. But I knew more than I cared to know before I left then in relation to this matter. I cannot see a man rise up and stand in open rebellion to his brethren in defiance of the pleadings of his quorum, and feel that he has the Spirit of God in him, which I witnessed previous to my departure in 1890; for I saw Brother Moses stand in open rebellion to his quoru m. I have prayed for him, and I want to say to you that personally I have shed more tears over this situation since the death of President Taylor than over all the griefs, public and private, that I have had since that time. And I think this is the same with my brethren. But what can we do? What position are we in? President Woodruff has given us the keynote. No man nor set of men can place themselves in the way of this Church and its pregress and stay there; for they will be swept aside. They cannot remain a stumbling block to the people.

There are a few paragraphs in the Doctrine and Covenants that I would like to read. I do not wish to multiply words, but I will say this: On a certain occasion, quite a long time ago, I went to President Woodruff and asked him the question, "What is the reason of this darkness that I see in the mind of a man whom I have loved like a brother, whom I had placed in my affection equal to any man upon the face of the earth?" This is the answer that he gave me: "He has

sought to rule over his brethren, and lost the Spirit." I will read from a revelation that has often been referred to; it is "A Prayer and Prophecies, written by Joseph the Seer, while in Liberty jail, Clay County, Missouri, March 20th, 1839:"

> Behold, there are many called, but few are chosen. And why are they not chosen?
>
> Because their hearts are set so much upon the things of this world, and aspire to the honors of men, that they do not learn this one lesson—
>
> That the rights of the Priesthood are inseparably connected with the powers of heaven, and that the powers of heaven cannot be controlled nor handled only upon the principle of righteousness.
>
> That they may be conferred upon us, it is true; but when we undertake to cover our sins, or to gratify our pride, or vain ambition, or to exercise control, or dominion, or compulsion, upon the souls of the children of men, in any degree of unrighteousness, behold, the heavens withdraw themselves; the Spirit of the Lord is grieved; and when it is withdrawn, Amen to the Priesthood, or the authority of that man.

Where, brethren and sisters, will you get the channel of communication opened up between you and the powers that reign over the earth? The God that sits in the heavens, and the angels and saints that visit us—through what line of communication do they come? God has placed these authorities here to guide His people, and when a man cuts that thread for himself, than the channel of revelation is destroyed, so far as that man is concerned. If you and I ever consider that we can reach God and get His mind and will in relation to this great work without receiving it through the channel of those men who stand at the head, then all I have to say to you or myself is, we have cut the thread between us and the Spirit of God, and we are left to wander in bye and forbidden paths. One channel, one organization! And no man may rise against that and expect that he will be favored of the Lord or permitted to enjoy His Spirit.

ELDER HEBER J. GRANT.

It is ever a source of pleasure to me to lift my voice in testimony of the divinity of the work in which we are engaged, and, so far as I possess the ability, I know of nothing that I desire so much to do as to keep the commandments of my Heavenly Father, and to labor to try and persuade the Latter day Saints to walk in that straight and narrow path that leads to life eternal. We have listened here today to the testimony that has been borne by Brother John Henry Smith, that although he was not personally acquainted with the Prophet Joseph Smith, yet he knows for himself and not for another that Joseph Smith was a prophet of God, and so also was John Taylor, and he bears witness to you here today that he knows that Wilford Woodruff is a prophet of the living God. In all humility, and knowing that the words I utter I will have to meet when I stand before the judgment seat of my Maker, I testify to you that I know that God lives; that I know that Jesus was the Christ; that I know that Joseph Smith was a prophet of God; that I know that Brigham Young

was a prophet of God; that I know that Wilford Woodruff is a prophet of God and the mouthpiece of God upon the earth today; that I know that his Counselors are chosen of God; that I know that the Twelve Apostles are inspired by the Lord; and that I know that no man living upon the face of the earth, who has received a testimony of the Gospel, can fail to recognize the authority of the Almighty God that rests upon the earth today, upon the shoulders of these men, and have the light and inspiration of the Spirit of God to guide him.

I pray for our brother whose name has been mentioned here today. I have fasted, I have wept, I have prayed for this brother of mine; yet I have been charged in the papers with having attacked him. God forbid that I should ever attack any man! But above all things, may God save me and my brethren from failing to recognize the power of Almighty God whereby you and I, through obedience to the principles of the Gospel, may be saved eternally.

ELDER GEORGE TEASDALE

It is wonderful the power of the Spirit and testimony that has rested upon the brethren at this conference. We have felt that God has been with us by His power, and also that it should be manifested unto the world that the Priesthood of the Son of God has been restored to the earth and those who bear it enjoy the light and the power of God that was promised unto those who would bow in obedience to the commandements of God. * * * * * * * * *

I desire also to testify to the truth of that that has been said concerning our Brother Moses. I love Brother Moses Thatcher. We were together in Mexico, and I esteemed him as one of my best friends. It was Brother Moses Thatcher that laid his hands upon me and blest me when I went to undertake the mission to Europe. I have plead for him, and all the Apostles have plead for him, and that is the reason no action has been taken. We wanted him to have plenty of opportunity for repentance; that he might come with a broken heart and contrite spirit, and say, Brethren, forgive me for all my wrong-doings; let me be one with you, as I have been in times that are past. That is what we have patiently waited for. We have plead before the Lord that he would touch and soften his heart, that he might see his position as we see it. Do you think that we are all under a false impression? Do you think that this body of men, who live near to the Lord, and whom you sustain as prophets, seers and revelators, are all wrong, and he is right? I pity anybody that entertains such an idea. It is rather untenable. It is not so. The reason there has been so much leniency is because we have loved him. We hear that he is increasing in health and strength, and we look for him to come with the broken heart and contrite spirit, and be associated with us. If there is anybody that loves him more than we do, I would like to know where you find him.

I am thankful to bear my testimony concerning this work, because I know it is true. I know that these principles we have received at this conference are true. We are the representatives of the Lord Jesus Christ, or we are not. And we can be tested; for we tell the people that if they will repent and worship the living and true God, and if they will be baptized by a man having authority, they shall receive the remission of their sins; and they shall know through the gift of the Holy Ghost concerning the doctrine; for the Lord will reveal it unto them. That is our promise to all the world, because we know that the Lord has spoken, and that he is a rewarder of those who diligently seek Him. I pray that the spirit of unity which exists between the Presidency and the Apostles may never be any less, but that it may increase until we shall become one with Christ as He is one with the Father, to His eternal honor and glory.

PRESIDENT JOSEPH F. SMITH.

I wish merely to say a word to guard the people from unwise sympathies. While we may have a great deal of love for our fellow beings, and especially for those who have been favored of the Lord in times past, we should exercise that love wisely. Now, I love men and women who are devoted to the cause of truth, and my sympathies are always with them. But it is impossible for me to sympathize with those who do wrong. * * *

The Lord has said:

> Therefore, be not afraid of your enemies; for I have decreed in my heart, saith the Lord that I will prove you in all things, whether you will abide in my covenant, even unto death, that you may be found worthy. For if ye will not abide in my covenant, ye are not worthy of me.

The man that will abide in the covenant is my brother and my friend, and has my sympathy and love, and I will sustain him. But the man who raises his heel and his voice against the servants of God and the authority of the Priesthood on the earth, is not my friend, and he has not my sympathy nor my love. Of course I respect the rights of all men, and honor those who are good and upright among all people. And God knows, and I would that you should know, that when a man repents of his sins, when a man that has done wrong will humble himself before the Lord, and will show his determination to abide in the covenant unto death, and comes with a humble spirit and contrite heart before the Lord and his brethren and acknowledges his fault, asks forgiveness, and his acts correspond with his professions, oh! God, how my heart yearns with love and affection, compassion, charity and forgiveness for that man. I will go more than half way to meet him. But I will not turn one hair out of my way for him that has hardened his heart against the Lord and against the truth, and that has turned away from the new and everlasting covenant and has proved that he will not abide in it. He must look to his own way. I will turn him over to God to deal with him as seemeth Him good.

That is where I stand in relation to this matter. We have not

dealt harshly with any man. Charity and love, mercy and kindness have prevaded all our deliberations and all our counsels together concerning our brethren, and all that we have had to do with. We never entertain a feeling of bitterness, or of resentment, or of wickedness in our hearts toward any man. On the contrary, we have exercised charity, forbearance, patience and longsuffering, until patience ceases to be a virtue, in my judgment, and it is about time that justice should claim its own. Mercy has done its work; patience has endured long enough; and all Israel must know that a man, whether he is an Apostle, a High Priest, or a Seventy, that will not hearken to the voice of God, that will not give his heart unto the Lord, that is not obedient, must cease to be fellowshipped by the people of God. We cannot uphold men who will pursue a course like this, or who will betray their brethren. We cannot afford it, and we cannot do it and be justified before the Lord.

We have received a communication, saying that we stood self-condemned before the people, because we had transgressed the law of God. We have transgressed no law of God, so far as we know. It is a clear case of the twelve jurymen, eleven of whom were united and saw eye to eye, while the one stood out alone, claiming that all the rest were wrong. We have borne and borne. Six months have passed —aye, years have passed, because that which occurred six months ago marked only the forks of the road, only the dividing line. For years before, we had tolerated, and patiently waited, we had prayed and petitioned, and we had suffered long, and yet to no avail. Our councils have seldom been graced by his presence. He has not felt it necessary to be one with his brethren. He has estranged himself from us, not we from him. He must abide the consequences. And we want to tell you that these matters do not hinge upon political questions either. We can tell you further, that every man is free, so far as this is concerned. The question is not in regard to any man's political faith. It is in regard to the order of the Priesthood. It is purely, clearly and solely an ecclesiastical matter. It is not a personal matter at all. It is a matter of compliance on the part of the members, with the order that God has instituted in the Church or non-compliance therewith. It is a matter concerning the government of the Church, and the authority which God has instituted to direct and to guide. It is the question as to whether the people will unite with the majority of the Priesthood, who are united and see eye to eye, or whether they will be misled by one man.

May the Lord help us to see the right, and not to condemn till we know all the truth, and not to judge our brethren nor be harsh; for we have not been.

The foregoing remarks were intended, not as an arraignment of Moses Thatcher or in any way as a trial of his cause, but simply as an explanation to the Latter-day Saints that they might understand the

situation. But he and his intimate associates and supporters construed those utterances as a public accusation, and Moses Thatcher, who had not attended the Conference, as it was reported on account of ill health, immediately after the Conference, made public addresses in the Cache Stake and seemed not to understand that he was acting without proper authority. The First Presidency thereupon issued the following:

NOTICE.

To the Officers and Members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints:

It having been reported to us that Brother Moses Thatcher has on three different occasions recently addressed congregations of the Saints at Logan, Cache Valley, this therefore is to notify you that by action of the Council of the First Presidency and Apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, the name of Moses Thatcher was not presented at the General Conferences of April and October, 1896, to be sustained in his office as an Apostle; and that this action of the authorities suspended him from exercising any of the functions of the Priesthood, that is, from preaching the Gospel or administering in any of the ordinances thereof, until he, by making satisfactory amends to his fellow-servants, should be restored to their fellowship and that of the Church.

WILFORD WOODRUFF,
GEORGE Q. CANNON,
JOSEPH F. SMITH,
First Presidency.

In consequence of the ill health of Moses Thatcher, by request of his friends action in his case had been postponed from time to time by the Council of the Twelve Apostles, and the understanding was had and expressed that he would not be required to appear and make satisfaction to that body until he should be in fit physical condition. After making the public addresses referred to above, he came to Salt Lake City and on October 15th, 1896, went to the Temple, as though he was still a member of the Quorum of the Twelve in full fellowship and good standing, to meet with the Presidency and Apostles in their prayer circle and general weekly meeting. He did not go to the annex, the ordinary place of ingress, but to the door where the Presidency and Apostles are admitted. He was not permitted to enter. By this exclusion he was brought to understand his position, and he applied by letter to President Lorenzo Snow for the appointment of a time and place to meet with the Apostles, and confer with them concerning his case. In response to that request a special meeting of

the Twelve was called to meet at the Historian's Office, on Thursday, November 12, 1896, and he was informed of the fact by letter from President Lorenzo Snow. The Council met as per appointment, but Moses Thatcher did not appear. Instead, he sent a long communication to the Quorum, going over the grounds of his case from his own standpoint, and informing the Apostles that they "need not convene."

In order to give him another opportunity to appear and place himself in harmony with his brethren, another special meeting was appointed at the Historian's Office, at 10 a. m., November 19th, of which he was duly notified by letter. When the time came he again failed to appear, but sent another communication, in which he stated that he had not been invited to be present.

The case of Moses Thatcher was then fully considered by the Council of Apostles, and their action is set forth in the following:

NOTICE.

To the Officers and Members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints:

This is to inform you that at a meeting of the Council of Apostles held this day (Thursday, Nov. 19th, 1896), there being present Lorenzo Snow, Franklin D. Richards, Brigham Young, Francis M. Lyman, John Henry Smith, George Teasdale, Heber J. Grant, John W. Taylor, Marriner W. Merrill and Anthon H. Lund, which meet ng was called for the purpose of considering and taking action on the case of Elder Moses Thatcher—and of which meeting and its object he had been duly notified—after a full consideration of all the circumstances of the case, and after each Apostle present had expressed himself upon the subject, it was unanimously decided that Moses Thatcher be severed from the Council of the Twelve Apostles, and that he be deprived of his Apostleship and other offices in the Priesthood.

LORENZO SNOW,
President Council of the Twelve Apostles.

This notice was served upon Moses Thatcher, and he gave to the morning papers, on Sunday, November 22, 1896, all the correspondence which has passed between him and President Lorenzo Snow in reference to this matter. Although this should have been recognized by all Latter day Saints as highly improper, it created sympathy for the deposed official of the Church among those who were not well informed concerning the order of the Church and the particulars of the case. The comments that were made induced some of the brethren who had listened to remarks from various sources, to send a communication to President Snow, asking for an explanation of the Thatcher

case, that false impressions concerning the course of the Twelve in relation to it might be removed. Following is the letter, with the reply of President Snow:

SALT LAKE CITY, November 28, 1896.

Elder Lorenzo Snow, President of the Twelve Apostles:

Dear Brother—As there has been much discussion over the correspondence between Moses Thatcher and yourself, and some of our own people are at sea in regard to the primary cause of Brother Thatcher's lack of harmony with your quorum, leading to his excommunication therefrom, in behalf of a number of such persons we pen you this communication.

We are aware that the difficulty mainly rested with the Twelve and one of its members; also that when action was taken in the case there was no need of your making further explanations. We can appreciate your abstinence from controversy, on a purely Church matter, through the public prints. But seeing that there appears to be a misapprehension of the facts in the case, and that many good people are liable, in consequence of that, to form incorrect conclusions, we respectfully ask you, if it be not inconsistent with any rule of the Church or of the Council over which you preside, to make some public statement which will serve to place this matter in its true light before the Saints, and clear away the mists which, to some at least, seem to surround the subject of Moses Thatcher's deposition. As he has given to the world the private correspondence that passed between you and him in a Church capacity, is it fair, even to yourself and your associates, to leave the matter in its present condition and open to so much misconstruction? If you would make an explanatory statement through the *Deseret News*, we believe it would be highly esteemed by many others, as well as

Your brethren in the Gospel,

NEPHI L. MORRIS,
ARNOLD G. GIAUQUE,
ARTHUR F. BARNES,
R. C. BADGER,
T. A. CLAWSON.

SALT LAKE CITY, November 30, 1896.

Messrs. Nephi L. Morris, Arnold G. Giauque, Arthur F. Barnes, R. C. Badger and T. A. Clawson:

Dear Brethren—In response to your esteemed communication of the 28th inst., I have determined, after conference with several of the Apostles, to offer some explanations on the case of Moses Thatcher and comments on the correspondence to which you refer, through the columns of the *Deseret News*.

The Apostles did not view the publication of the letters that passed to and from Brother Moses Thatcher and them as calling for any controversy on their part. Nor did they think it a proper thing to give those ecclesiastical communications general publicity through

secular newspapers. The letters bearing my signature were not prepared with a design for publication, whatever the others might have been—and were regarded as Church matters for the consideration solely of the respective parties. It is only because those letters have been given to the public, and because it seems, from what you say, that an improper impression has been made upon the minds of some people thereby, that I comply with the request to meet some of the statements they contain.

The evident purpose in publishing those communications was to excite public sympathy, and the unnecessary and superfluous appeals they contain convey the impression that they were concocted for that purpose. They were not relevant to the issue involved. Moses Thatcher was not on trial for his fellowship. Specific charges were not preferred either in public or in private. The question was solely as to his standing as one of the Apostles, in consequence of his lack of harmony with the Quorum of the Twelve of which he was a member. That question he could have settled at any time if he had so desired, and that without a formal trial. By placing himself in harmony with his Quorum, in the spirit of humility and conformity with its rules, of which he was not in ignorance, he could have saved himself all the trouble and deprivation of which he complains.

In his review of what he calls his case, he lays great stress on the matter of the Declaration of Principles, which he refused to sign after it had received the endorsement of the First Presidency, the Apostles (excepting himself), the Patriarch, the Seven Presidents of the Seventies, and the Presiding Bishopric, comprising the general authorities of the Church. His excuse is that he had only about an hour and thirty minutes in which to consider it. Usually men do not require much time to consider a matter which they have always held to be right. There was nothing new in that document as it relates to Church discipline. It contains that which has always been an established doctrine of the Church. When the committee which prepared it submitted it to the other Church authorities, they signed it after reading without hesitation and without requiring time to deliberate. It embodies so manifestly a conceded and necessary rule that every one in harmony with the Church authorities accepted it at once, and the Church as a body has received and adopted it as an essential rule. Why should Moses Thatcher alone, of all the Church authorities, feel that he could not sign it, as he alleges, "without stultification?" Was not that in itself evidence that he was and had been out of harmony with his brethren? And are they not men as little disposed as any one living to stultify themselves, or to assent to anything wrong that is of vital importance to them and to the Church?

He charges that his letter refusing to sign the Declaration was "suppressed." There was no suppression in the matter at all. The letter was not addressed to the Conference nor to the public. Out of mercy and compassion to him no reference was made to his contumacy at the April Conference, but his name was simply dropped frsm the

list of authorities presented. How could he have been sustained under the circumstances? There are six of the Twelve now living who voted for his appointment to the Apostleship. Not one of them would have sustained him for that position if it had been known that he then entertained views entirely out of harmony with those of that body. The letter addressed on April 6 to his associates was a deliberately composed communication showing that he was able to understand the document which he refused to sign, and his prompt publication of that letter, in a secular newspaper, shows that he had a deliberate intention to oppose the Declaration and defy his brethren who promulged it. But if he did not have sufficient time to consider the Declaration at the April Conference, what about the six months which elapsed before the October Conference? Was not that time enough? During that interval he was visited by many of the brethren, some of them Apostles, and no change was effected, but he failed even to attend the October Conference or to manifest a disposition to conform to the principle of the Declaration.

It is true that he was in poor bodily health during that period. But he was not too ill to upbraid brethren who tried to impress him with the danger of his position, nor to accuse some of them of having "blanketed their conscience" in signing the Declaration.

He states in his letters that he would have attended the October Conference if it had not been for the "assurances and reassurances" he had received that nothing would be done concerning his standing until his health should be restored. He then complains bitterly of the explanations given to the Conference as to his position and seeks to convey the impression that they were a breech of good faith.

The "assurances" to which he refers were faithfully fulfilled. He was left in statu quo. Every time it was shown that the condition of his health would not admit of his meeting with his quorum the question of his standing was postponed. But meanwhile he and his friends were not slow to talk about his associates and to convey unwarranted impressions concerning their course in his "case." So much misunderstanding was thereby created that it became absolutely necessary to make some explanations that the Latter-day Saints might not be deceived. President Woodruff was so strongly impressed with this that he addressed the Conference on the subject and his statements were endorsed by several of the Twelve who followed him.

This was no "trial" of Moses Thatcher. It was simply a necessary explanation of his status. It involved the question of his lack of harmony with the Church authorities. His claim that he was publicly accused and therefore should have a public trial is astonishingly absurd. He was not accused in the sense of a trial or investigation. The fact of his lack of harmony with the authorities was explained and shown to be of much earlier date than his refusal to sign the Declaration and his engaging in active politics. To place himself in harmony with the Twelve, or refuse to do so, required no "trial" either public or private. He did neither. Yet the assurance given him

which he misconstrues were observed and his "case" was not called up until he was able to appear.

It was but a few days after the Conference, even if it had entirely closed, before he appeared and spoke at public meetings as though he still held the authority in which he had not been sustained at Conference. This necessitated the announcement from the First Presidency through the *Deseret News* that he had no right to officiate in the Priesthood while in his suspended condition.

Notwithstanding [the facts stated in*] that announcement, when he chose to present himself to the authorities he presumed to attempt entrance to the Temple for that purpose, and at a time when the First Presidency as well as the Twelve met for the consideration of other Church matters and for holding their prayer circle. No one could attend but those of their own body, nor even enter the House unless in good standing. No member of the Church without the proper recommend can obtain admittance to the Temple, no matter how much he may have contributed to its erection. That would cut no figure at all in the right of entrance. It is amazing that Moses Thatcher should attempt to intrude the boast of his contributions into the question of entering the Temple of God when not in good standing and full fellowship.

His exclusion from the Temple he construes into being "denied the privilege of meeting with the Quorum." No one knew better than he that there was no such denial. The assurance given him by Elder F. D. Richards and others of the Quorum was proof of their willingness to meet him and their joy at his manifestation of even a desire to meet them. That there were other places and occasions when he could properly have an interview with his brethren he fully understood, and he subsequently applied for it as he should have done long before.

In passing I will notice his technical quibble about the closing of the Temple against him on October 15th for his disregard of my letter of October 23rd, which he says is hard for him to understand. A careful reading of my letter will show that the difficulty is of his own manufacture. What I said conveys no such meaning as he asserts. I said, "This being the condition of affairs you were not admitted to the Temple on the forenoon of Thursday." "The condition of affairs" which caused that exclusion is set forth in the first paragraph of my letter, and relates to occurrences before the 15th. It is true that my letter of the 23rd in reply to his of the 16th is incidentally mentioned, but only as something growing out of what happened on the 15th, and of course was not intended to apply as a condition existing before that date. This perversion of plain language shows what small evasions will be resorted to when one gets into the dark.

Reference to the Conference discourses published in the *Deseret News* was made that Brotner Thatcher might know exactly what the brethren said, that he might see the necessity there was for the people

*These words were omitted from the *Deseret News*.

to understand where he stood, and that he might see the need of putting himself in harmony with the Church authorities.

It is necessary to notice his complaint that he had not been invited to attend the meeting at which final action was taken in his case. In his letter dated November 4th, he says:

> I returned to this city Thursday—a week ago tomorrow—and have daily expected to hear respecting a time when I could see the brethren once more together. No word having reached me respecting that matter, I adopt this means of respectfully asking you when such meeting can be arranged. As early a reply as convenient will greatly oblige,
>
> Your brother in the Gospel.
> MOSES THATCHER.

To this I replied, as he has published, under date of November 6

> In accordance with your wishes for a meeting, I take pleasure in appointing 2 o'clock on Thursday next at the Historian's Office, upon which occasion the quorum will be pleased to meet with you. With kindest regards, your brother and fellow servant, LORENZO SNOW.

On the day thus appointed the Apostles met, at the time and place thus designated, and they received his lengthy communication dated Nov. 11, in which he said:

> I shall not trouble my brethren therefore to convene in a special meeting named for Thursday at 2 p. m. at the Historian's Office.

Thereupon the Council of the Apostles gave him one week more, and notified him that his case would be called up for action at a meeting to be held in the Historian's office at 10 a. m. on Thursday, the 19th inst., as appears in my letter, published by him with the other correspondence.

When that day arrived we received his last letter in which he said:

> As there is to be no trial of any case and as I am not requested to be present, I take it to be the purpose of considering my case, etc.

Why should there have been any further tampering with the case? Moses Thatcher was entirely out of harmony with his brethren the Apostles. He was simply required to put himself in accord with them as is required by the Gospel and the order of the councils of the Priesthood. That he declined to do. After asking for a time and place to be appointed when he could meet with them, and in response to that request a time and place were set, and the Apostles came from distant points for the purpose of meeting with him, instead of appearing he coolly notified them by letter that he would "not trouble them to convene!" Then when they gave him another week in which to appear, and notified him that his case would be called up for consideration and action, he still treated the Council with contempt and asserted: "I am not requested to be present."

That the Council of the Apostles took the only consistent action that was left open must be evident to every Latter-day Saint

who has eyes to see and a heart to understand. Why Moses Thatcher did not meet with his brethren, after they had assembled at his own request, is best known to himself. Notwithstanding his past course they were ready to receive him with open arms if he had come in the proper spirit and put himself in accord with them. As he would not, they expelled him from the Priesthood as they were in duty bound to do.

It should be known that the disaffection of Moses Thatcher dates back to a time long before political difficulties could enter into the matter. President Woodruff has stated publicly that Moses Thatcher had not been in full harmony with his Quorum since the death of President John Taylor. Trouble was had with him before that time.

In 1886 he proclaimed in public discourses ideas and predictions not endorsed by his brethren. At Lewiston, Cache county, notes were taken of his utterances and published on a fly-leaf. He was subsequently written to by President Taylor, and his answer is on file. While he claimed that he had not been accurately reported, he gave his own language, under his own hand, to the effect of predictions of events to occur within five years, which have failed of fulfilment and which were founded on erroneous interpretations of Scripture. He wrote for publication a sort of retraction which really took nothing back but merely charged partial errors in the report of his extravagant remarks.

He was out of harmony with his brethren in relation to a standing appellate High Council, which he claimed should be appointed and which notion he has never acknowledged was incorrect.

He disputed with President Taylor as to the appointment of President of the Logan Temple and contended for a man of his own selection, even after the President announced the appointment by revelation.

His bearing with his brethren of the Twelve was such that he could not brook dissent and resented their nonacceptance of his personal views.

When Wilford Woodruff's accession to the Presidency was under consideration, as the proper successor, he expressed opinions which showed that he regarded human smartness and business ability as above that simplicity of character and susceptibility to divine impressions which are notable in that faithful servant of God, and objected that such a man could not grasp the situation of affairs or cope with the difficulties arising. He was overruled but persisted in his views.

When President George Q. Cannon, after the decease of President Taylor, was in prison for infraction of the anti-polygamy laws, Moses claimed that Brother Cannon had defrauded him, and he threatened in the presence of President Woodruff and others of the Twelve to sue him at law, and thus bring many private affairs before the public through the courts. Only on being emphatically warned by President Woodruff and others that such a course, particularly in Brother Can-

non's condition, would result disastrously to him in his Church position did he desist. On President Cannon's release from confinement the matter was fully investigated and it was demonstrated that instead of Brother Cannon's owing him he was in Brother Cannon's debt to an amount which he subsequently paid. For his insults and hard language towards Brother Cannon he has never apologized nor made any amends. This incident is referred to in President Cannon's absence from the State. He has always preserved silence on this matter and did not wish it to be mentioned against Brother Thatcher. But it is important as showing Moses Thatcher's spirit and bearing towards his brethren.

Brother Thatcher makes great pretentions of devotion to the Church and declares he has "never shirked any responsibility." The people in many of the various Stakes of Zion who have been visited by the Apostles may ask themselves when they have ever seen Moses Thatcher at their quarterly conferences or other Church gatherings.

He has neglected the meetings of his Quorum for years. This was not always on account of ill-health. He was able, at least in the earlier part of the time, to attend to business and pleasure affairs, apparently in good health and spirits. The roll book of meetings of the Presidency and the Apostles shows that from May, 1889 to April, 1896, a period of about seven years, he was in attendance at the regular weekly meeting but 33 times. There were held 277 of those meetings, at which President Woodruff, though weighted down by age and numerous cares, was present 256 times; his absence was always on account of sickness. Brother Thatcher's residence was most of the time in Logan, but the hour was set so that he and others at a distance could have reasonable opportunity to attend.

Brother Thatcher's spirit has been contumacious and he has been self opinionated and arbitrary. Previous to the dedication of the Temple his brethren labored with him for many hours to bring him into the proper frame of mind to unite with them in that sacred ceremony. His condition was not entirely satisfactory at the close of the protracted interview, but was accepted out of charity and mercy to him that he might not be excluded from the dedication, with the hope that the spirit of the occasion would influence him to thorough reconciliation. President Woodruff's announcement of harmony among the brethren was made with that understanding, but has been adroitly turned by Brother Thatcher to shut off all that occurred before that time, and which would not now be alluded to but for his own utterances and reference to his pretended humility and harmony.

In accepting nomination for a political office, which if elected thereto would have taken him away from his ecclesiastical duties for long periods, without consultation with his quorum and the Presidency, he could not but have known that he was violating a requirement of high officials in the Church. Yet he would not consult with them, while he was able to attend political gatherings and business meetings

although in poor health. Here again he was out of harmony with his brethren.

There was no need for any loss of manhood or proper independence nor the forfeiture of any of the rights of citizenship. But if he did not value his Apostleship and Priesthood as of the very first consideration he was not worthy to hold them, and his subsequent course shows that he held them in great esteem in theory but in very small esteem in practice. Fine words and sympathetic phrases do very well to influence the public, but they count for nothing in the face of deeds that contradict them, and the failure to do that which is so rhetorically professed. The standing and fellowship of Moses Thatcher as a member of the Church have not been brought into question, therefore there has been no trial. He has been dealt with by his quorum for lack of harmony with his associates, something that was entirely in his own power to correct without great exertion or much time. If his standing in the Church was at stake, specific charges would be made, and he would have to answer to them in the usual way, which is not and has not been by public demonstration.

What has been done was necessary and a duty. Action was not taken until it was certain that no further delay would be of any use or benefit. Moses Thatcher has been treated with greater consideration and mercy than any other man who has taken the course which he has pursued. He has been prayed for, waited upon, pleaded with and wept over until his rebellion and contumacy were seen to be invincible, and he is in open hostility to regulations which the whole Church has adopted and ratified. He could not and cannot be any longer empowered to act in the authority of the Holy Priesthood.

And now let the Latter-day Saints ponder upon the situation, and take the warning given by the Prophet Joseph Smith as a key to the Church for all time. It is as follows:

> I will give you one of the keys of the mysteries of the Kingdom. It is an eternal principle, that has existed with God from all eternity. That man who rises up to condemn others, finding fault with the Church, saying that they are out of the way, while he himself is righteous, then know assuredly, that that man is in the high road to apostasy; and if he does not repent, will apostatize, as God lives.—*History of Joseph Smith, July* 2, 1839.

In conclusion I repeat the words of Him who spake as never man spake:

> He that exalteth himself shall be abased, but he that humbleth himself shall be exalted.

Your brother in the Gospel,

LORENZO SNOW.

Previous to the publication of the foregoing letters, some young men in Salt Lake City addressed a letter to their father residing at St. George; they received the following reply, which sets forth so clear and comprehensive a view of the subject that it is here presented for the careful consideration of the reader:

ST. GEORGE, November 28, 1896.

My Dear Sons, Gordon, Richard and Frederick—Since writing you last and on the same day I wrote you about the Thatcher matter, we received yours of the 22nd, and also had the Sunday and Monday Herald, so that I have the letters between Brother Thatcher and President Snow, and also have the articles of the Tribune on the matter, as well as the *News* articles up to the 24th. The mail did not connect yesterday, so I have nothing later, but I think I have enough to size up the situation fairly well.

An outsider on reading the letter between Thatcher and Snow will very naturally think that Moses Thatcher has not had fair treatment from the fact that his Quorum would not formulate any charges for him to plead to, and dealt with him without giving him a chance to be heard in self-defence. Under a legal procedure, or in common business transactions, this view would undoubtedly be the correct one, but to one who is somewhat familiar with the principles of the Gospel, the organization of the Church and its quorums of the Priesthood—the matter assumes a different aspect.

The statements of the members of his Quorum made at the last Conference throw considerable light on the trouble, even though nothing definite was said as to the particular points of difference between him and the others of the Twelve. That he stood alone as opposed to his Quorum in any matter of church discipline, and refused to put himself in harmony therewith, after a fair time had been given him, is in itself enough cause for his being placed outside the Quorum, as it is impossible for a body of that kind to do its proper work with disunion in its midst; and while the people generally may not have known all the matters of difference, still Thatcher's usefulness in his place as an Apostle would be impaired, and he could not do his duty in his high and holy calling. This being so, it was his plain duty to place himself in harmony with the others of his Quorum, or, failing to do that he should have resigned, and not have been a stumbling block in the way of the progress of the cause which he professes to think so much of.

It may be said that the matters of policy and discipline were such as he could not conscientiously sustain, and that therefore he is justified in refusing to endorse or work for them. Admitting that to be the case, he had a right in his place in the Quorum to give his views in as strong a manner as he felt necessary, and urge upon the others to adopt them; but when he had done that and the majority was against his ideas, to say nothing of there being in this case the entire eleven against one, then he must acquiesce in their decision, yield his judgment to the others, and do his best to make the policy decided upon a success; if it were not possible to give it his fullest sanction, he should at least not do anything to oppose or obstruct the workings of the Quorum, for the minute he doe, such a thing he is not fit to hold his place in that Quorums

and must make way for some one who can and will work in harmony with the heads of the cause.

It is not a supposable case that the eleven of the Quorum and the three of the First Presidency are all going to take a course which is opposed to the good of the Church, and that one man is the one who is right, especially when that one man is only one of twelve of equal authority, with another quorum of three still over them. While in ordinary cases of trial for fellowship the accused has the right to have charges preferred against him to which he may answer and rebut if he can, this is another kind of a case; it is simply a matter of harmony and fellowship between a member of a quorum and the quorum itself, and consists of differences of opinion and opposition to the decisions of the quorum, with which all are acquainted and which need no formal charges to acquaint the party out of harmony with what he is expected to make right so that he may be in fellowship with his Quorum.

It is not a matter where the eleven should go to him and make the differences right, but it is for the one out of harmony to come to them and set himself straight; or, failing to do so, to resign his place, so that the cause may not suffer from the want of union among the leading quorums. You will see from this the difference between a case where a member of the Church has committed some act against the laws of discipline of the Church, and the case of a member of a quorum being out of harmony in his own quorum. In the first case the party who is accused of a wrong must have the charges specified; must have the opportunity of being confronted with his accusers, and of producing any evidence he may have, to rebut the accusations against him; then by the law and the testimony only can he be condemned.

No one can know and understand better than Thatcher these principles of order in the organization of the Church, and when he called on the members of his Quorum for specific charges against himself he must have known that he was requiring something out of order, something which they would not have been justified in making, and to all appearances he was only doing this to make a record by which he could claim that he had been unjustly dealt with, in being deposed without a hearing, depending on the ignorance of "outside" people and many of the "inside" ones as well, to justify him in his course, and by this means gain popularity and make a schism in the Church, or at least to ride into political power by his show of independence of the Church.

While his letters seem to exhibit a meekness of spirit, still there is something of a studied effort at posing for future effect, so that he might have the quorum at a seeming disadvantage when the matter became public. A careful reading between the lines will make this plain to a spirit of discernment.

He exhibited the cloven hoof the moment he announced himself a candidate for the Senate on a platform opposed to the rule of the

Church, and this was done even before he had been deposed, and while he still pretended to expect to hold his position. What further proof can be wanted of his disposition to try and gain political power and prestige among the class called "Young Utah?" Of course he knows that there is a large class of the young of this Church which does not have a very good understanding of the Church order and discipline, and he evidently thinks he can work upon the sympathies of this class by pretending not to have had a fair showing to defend himself, but when the young, and many of the older ones, too, who have not understood this, have time to think the matter over, they will not see the thing in the light that at first seemed to be so clear to them, and Thatcher will stand where he belongs in their estimation.

While Thatcher may be an honest man, and a man whom any one would be disposed to like, still there can be no doubt that he has allowed his ambition, mixed probably with his personal feelings toward some of the leading men, to have such an influence over him, that he has thrown away a position which is the highest and most honorable in the world.

While there may have been many mistakes made by Church authorities, and may be many more made in the future, it is no justification for a man in Thatcher's position to take the stand he has done, and his duty was to try and learn by the errors committed, and endeavor to have them avoided in the future. No man is perfect, and although there are men holding high places who are entitled to the spirit of the Lord to teach them how to act so as to bring about the best results for the cause they represent, still they may at times commit errors in judgment and even do things through selfish principle, not in keeping with their professions and high callings; so that we should not tie to any man so far as our faith in the principles of the Gospel and our ideas of right are concerned, but endeavor so to live that we may have the spirit of discernment and truth to guide us aright on all subjects.

A few weeks since it would have been considered by many as almost a sacrilege to have questioned anything which Brother Thatcher might have said or done, but his fall shows how fallible is man, and that any one of those now in full standing may go the same way, for no man is of himself safe for a day or an hour. I desire to keep enough of the spirit of the Lord in close communion to enable me to judge between right and wrong, as I consider that one of the greatest of God's gifts to man.

There is one thing we should bear in mind regarding those high in authority, and that is that they are placed on a kind of a pedestal, where their faults and weaknesses are plainly visible, and where they appear more prominent than where exhibited by others who are not in so prominent a position and have not so much expected from them.

As to the merits of any business troubles and jealousies there may have been between Brother Thatcher and others of the authori-

ties, I am not prepared to judge, as I have only heard one side of a portion of them, and nothing at all from Thatcher's side, but I assume Thatcher is able to look pretty well after his own part of such things, as he is a bright and intelligent business man.

While there may be a difference of opinion as to the wisdom of the course being pursued by the *Deseret News* in threatening the supporters of Thatcher for the Senate, with Church power, still I would rather have an open fight at any time than to be stating one policy for the outside to hear and pursuing another in secret, so that I am willing to stand by the Church in an open fight for any principle of right, and at no matter what cost.

As to Thatcher's chances for the Senate, I am unable to give an intelligent opinion, as I am not acquainted with a great number of the legislature, but I think no one who is a firm Latter-day Saint will vote to place him there, because he has announced himself as standing on a platform which is positively opposed to the discipline of the Church, and which rules of discipline have been approved by nearly all the members thereof. When he takes that stand he is opposing the Church in a vital place, and I see no other course than for some one to make a complaint against him for conduct unbecoming a Latter-day Saint, and unless he retracts from the position he will necessarily have to be cut off the Church. This may seem harsh to some, but there can be no other logical outcome to a course such as he is now taking. It would be the same if any other member of the Church should announce himself on such a platform.

I believe I am as independent in my ideas and action as any one can well be, but I try to be consistent with my ideas of honor and justice, and to recognize order and authority in Church government. The position I take on the Thatcher case seems to me to be the only one which can be maintained in justice to the rights of the Church itself.

I have a strong dislike to injustice to any person or cause, and will always defend the right as I understand it.

If I were a member of the Legislature, I should surely vote against any one assuming the position Thatcher does, not believing that politics of that kind should stand in the way of the cause of truth. I have talked with none here, and can't say how much sympathy Thatcher has, but suppose there will be a good many who will be led away by the speciousness of his pleas of unfairness; my sympathy for him is for his great loss, and I would be glad to have him come around and make all right if he can do it honestly.

All well; very cold for two nights. Ice half an inch thick on creeks. Love to all. Your affectionate father,

EDWIN G. WOOLLEY.

As evidence of the impression produced on the minds of persons not connected with the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, by

the dispute between that Church and Moses Thatcher, the following article from the pen of a Catholic clergyman is here presented. It is taken from the Denver *Catholic* of November 28th, of which Rev. T. H. Malone is editor:

THE MORMON CHURCH AND POLITICS.

It seems to us that most of the newspapers which have commented upon the action of the Mormon Church in its treatment of ex-Apostle Moses Thatcher, have failed utterly to grasp the correct position of the Mormon Church in the matter.

Mr. Thatcher has been put outside the fellowship of the Mormon Church for having, as alleged, accepted civil office without taking counsel with the Church. No one, we think, will question the right of the Church to deal with its members in its own way, and if Mr. Thatcher has transgressed some law of the Mormon body we fail to see wherein any outsider has the right of complaint.

A great cry has been raised against the Mormon Church because of its treatment of Mr. Thatcher, and the old cry of interfering in politics renewed. But we confess that a careful examination fails to show that the Mormon Church has in any way interfered in politics in its treatment of Mr. Thatcher. If Mr. Thatcher violated a rule of the Mormon institution in seeking and accepting office without the permission of the Mormon Church, he clearly made himself liable to the treatment which has been meted out to him. And in this view of the case it is quite clear that Mr. Thatcher is insincere in seeking to use his violation of Church discipline as an argument in favor of his election to the United States Senate.

If the Democratic Legislature of Utah should be influenced in Mr. Thatcher's favor because of his treatment by the Church to which he has professed allegiance, the Legislature would be clearly guilty of doing by indirection what it is prohibited by the constitution from doing directly, viz: of interfering in a church matter which in no way concerns it.

The Mormon people have shown a far better temper in this whole affair than any of their critics. It is entirely outside the province of the Utah Legislature to vindicate Mr. Thatcher in a matter that pertains solely to the Mormon Church; and if the Legislature of Utah should assume any such responsibility it will have entered upon a very dangerous proceeding, and one which will absolutely dissolve the Mormon Church from its expressed obligation not to interfere in politics.

There is a fundamental principle involved in this controversy which the Gentiles of Utah should not lose sight of.

On Sunday, December 13th, Moses Thatcher had a very lengthy communication in the morning papers, ostensibly addressed to President Lorenzo Snow, as a reply to his letter of explanation which appears in this pamphlet, but covering much wider ground, and entering into subjects entirely outside of President Snow's remarks. While expressing great hostility to the mingling of religion and politics, it mixes them up in a manner which conveys to the thoughtful reader the impression that political office is the chief end in view of the writer, and the religious part of his argument is so framed as to lead up to, and make eminently conspicuous the platform on which he presents himself for the suffrages of the members of the Utah State Legislature. He also attacks the *Deseret News* on political ground, all of which is extraneous to the letter of explanation published by President Lorenzo Snow, and while addressed to him is clearly intended to influence the Legislature and the public mind.

Starting with the assertion that in writing his letter: "The duty is a painful one, so painful indeed, that personal considerations would be a motive insufficient to induce me even on a matter so vitally important to me and mine, to take up my pen in self defence," he goes on through nearly seven columns of print to make statements and offer pleas which are almost entirely personal to himself, and utterly fails to make it appear that there was anything like a "duty" incumbent on him to make any of the statements which he gives to the public.

The explanations given by President Snow, in response to the letter of inquiry addressed to him, Moses Thatcher denounces as "public charges to gratify the curiosity of five young men of Salt Lake City," and complains because the specified charges against him, which he demanded previous to his deposal, were withheld from him but are now made public.

It should be plain to every intelligent mind that has paid attention to this matter, that no "charges" have been made against Moses Thatcher to place him on trial, either in public or in private, with the exception of the charge that he was not in harmony with his Quorum and the General authorities of the Church. This fact he appears to ignore entirely. The explanations given by President Wilford Woodruff and other Church leaders at the October Conference, and those given in President Snow's letter, were not "charges" on which Moses Thatcher was to be placed on trial, but were necessary items of information for the enlightenment of the members of the Church, who were under the impression that the ouly difference between Moses

Thatcher and the Church authorities was in relation to the Declaration of Principles, enunciated at the April Conference. The insinuation that they were given merely to gratify the curiosity of a few young men is scarcely worthy of mention, except to show the underlying spirit of an effusion professing candor and fairness. The "pleas" for mercy and "cries of anguish" of which he speaks could all have been obviated by a few minutes conversation with the brethren of his Quorum in a concilatory spirit. This he could have had whenever he so desired, and such expressions fail to move upon the sympathies of enlightened people, in view of that simple fact.

Another complaint by Moses Thatcher is that,

"During all these weary months, while friends and physicians believed I was on the verge of the grave, I was administered to only once by members of our Quorum, although day after day engagements made for that purpose were for reasons unknown to me not kept. And after the Manifesto was returned to you unsigned, none of the Apostles, except the three mentioned, ever came to my house or visited me for any purpose whatever."

This statement is amazing in view of the facts, unless for charity's sake the idea is entertained that the sickness to which he alludes has blotted many things from his memory. Times without number members of his quorum visited him during his sickness, and were always ready to administer to him when he was ready to receive their administrations. President Wilford Woodruff and Joseph F. Smith also waited upon him. On several occasions, after waiting a long time to see him, some of his brethren failed to obtain any interview. None of them is aware of any "engagement made for that purpose" which was not fulfilled. It is not customary for the Elders of the Church to thrust their offices upon invalids, but the rule is: "If any are sick among you, let him call for the Elders of the Church, who shall anoint him with oil and pray over him, and the prayer of faith shall save the sick." No one of the authorities of the Church has ever refused a call from Moses Thatcher or members of his family, to administer to him. After his refusal to sign the Declaration of Principles (or "Manifesto" as he calls it,) it is true that calls were not made upon him so frequently as before. He had demonstrated that he was out of harmony with his brethren and was in such a frame of mind and condition of body that conversation with him was almost an impossibility. He was so excited and determined to talk himself, that any attempt

to enlighten him or respond to his voluble expressions was utterly in vain.

But why should he now complain that he was not "labored with" by his brethren in reference to the Declaration of Principles when he admits "I understood the Manifesto then as I understand it now?"

The ground he offers for this complaint is this:

"It may be that Elder B. H. Roberts signed it without consideration, but I have been authoritatively informed that, strong and healthy as he was in mind and body, several members of the Quorum to which I belonged labored with him day after day for weeks before he consented to accept the principles of absolutism it contains."

He then remarks:

"But when I afterwards learned that its claims had been discussed for weeks by the other members of the Quorum of Apostles, that a systematic presentation of its grounds had been devoted to Brother Roberts,—I was led to wonder if the brief time allotted me was the result of design or accident."

These complaints and insinuations are founded upon error. The Declaration of Principles, which was formulated by a committee, was not prepared until a time subsequent to the reconciliation of Elder B. H. Roberts with his brethren. He needed no persuation to append to it his signature. He signed it without objection, as did all of the Authorities of the Church to whom it was presented, with the sole exception of Moses Thatcher. The principle it contains is so manifestly essential to the welfare of the Church, and so clearly in accord with the order of the Holy Priesthood, as understood from the beginning, that there was no need for hesitation or delay. The necessity for its enunciation at that particular juncture must be apparent to every reflecting mind, in view of the attitude assumed by Moses Thatcher and those who shared his opinions. It is often necessary to repeat well established doctrines and to reiterate principles which all experienced Saints ought to understand, but which some of them seem to forget or neglect to practice.

His complaint about his exclusion from the Temple is repeated with quibbles about dates, one of which was fully explained in President Snow's letter. The spirit in which they are put forward will be discerned by the majority of the Latter-day Saints. Complaint is again made by Moses Thatcher of the remarks made by President Woodruff and others concerning him at the October Conference, in this wise:

"I had received assurances and reassurances that nothing would be done or said affecting my case until I should report myself ready for trial."

This statement is another of those remarkable departures from the exact truth, which occur so frequently in his latest publication. The promises made to those of his friends who expressed the desire that he should not be called to account by his quorum before he was physically able to endure the mental and bodily exertion necessary to undergo such an investigation, did not pledge any person to refrain from speaking on the subject. He and his friends did not appear to think there was any seal of silence to be placed on their lips, and it was to correct the improper impression which had been made upon the minds of many of the Saints that the explanation given by the brethren at the Conference was considered necessary. Moses Thatcher contended, as he contends now, that his failure to sign the Declaration of Principles was the only note of discord between him and the Church authorities. The remarks made at the October Conference placed the matter in its true light, and the lack of harmony between him and his brethren was shown to have long existed.

He disputes and ridicules the statement of President Snow that the promise to his friends was faithfully fulfilled, and asks:

"When a tribunal pronounces a man guilty and announces to the world its judgment, has he been left 'in statu quo?'"

Here again Moses Thatcher assumes that he was placed on trial, when there had been no tribunal, no trial, no charges, and no judgment. His case was certainly left "in statu quo," and was not investigated nor acted upon until by his own request a time and place were set for the purpose, at which he refused to be present. Once more, charity would suggest that his singular objections and failure to recognize the realities of his case are attributable to mental weakness consequent upon his affliction.

He next attempts to evade the evidence adduced to show his lack of harmony with his brethren and an established rule of the Church, in his threat made to President Woodruff, and several of the Twelve, to sue President George Q. Cannon at law when Brother Cannon was imprisoned for infraction of the anti-polygamy laws. This he does by quoting a receipt which he gave to Brother Cannon as president of the Bullion-Beck Company for certain

shares of stock in that company, which were delivered to him by the secretary. What application that can have to his accusation against President Cannon, and his threat to take a civil case against a brother into a court of law, before seeking redress according to the law of the Lord, is also one of those peculiarities in Moses Thatcher's latest plea, which it is difficult to harmonize with good reason and Church doctrine. The point which he, not very skillfully, evades is that he was out of harmony with the President of the Church and his associates in his spirit and course towards President Cannon in this instance. H professes not to understand how this matter being "a business transaction between two members of the Church" has a bearing on his affairs as recently made public. Such a transaction between two members of the Church has been many times in its history the foundation for a trial in its courts, involving the fellowship of the member who sued or threatened to sue his brother, before that recourse which the Church provides has first been exhausted.

Following this evasion of the real issue, is an endeavor to explain the subject of his utterances in Cache County and other places in 1886. He says:

"Not one word uttered by me at Lewiston on the occasion referred to partook of the nature of a prophecy as coming from me."

Let us see. The report of his remarks which was circulated at the time on a fly leaf, numerously distributed, was as follows:

WORDS SPOKEN BY MOSES THATCHER AT LEWISTON, CACHE CO., 1886.

It is my belief that every city, precinct, County and Territorial Office in this Territory will be in the hands of our enemies, that we will be so burdened with taxes that it will be almost more than human nature can endure; that we shall cry to the Lord both by night and by day for deliverance; that when our hearts are sufficiently subdued, that our entire trust will be in the Lord, then shall that man like unto Moses be raised up and raise us up, and lead us out of bondage back to Jackson County, in the State of Missouri: There will be no hesitation; everything shall be decisive and prompt; the mountains shall tremble before him, and if there be a tree or anything else in the way of their progress, it shall be plucked up by the power of God. Then is the time that the Scripture shall be fulfilled that says, "One shall chase a thousand, and two shall put ten thousand to flight."

It is my belief that the time of our deliverance will be within five years, the time indicated being Feburary 14th, 1891 (see *Millennial Star*, Vol. 15, page 205), and that the man raised up will be no other

than the Prophet Joseph Smith in the resurrected body; the power to lead Israel in the latter days, as Moses lead him anciently having been sealed upon his head by his father Joseph Smith, the Patriarch of the Church at that time. If Father Smith had the power to bless, and that he had this power is most certain, from the fact that he was ordained to this office and calling by his son the Prophet, before the above blessing was promised on the head of Joseph Smith.

No other man can perform this mission of the Prophet Joseph Smith (*Millennial Star*, Vol. 15, page 620). I do not say all the people of the nation will be destroyed within the time mentioned, but I do say that in consequence of the wickedness and corruption of the officers of this nation the government will pass into the hands of the Saints, and that within five years. There will not be a cityi n the Union that will not be in danger of disruption by the Knights of Labor who are becoming a formidable power in the land. You people in quiet Lewiston need not be surprised if within the next four years the railroad is torn up from Ogden to the Missouri River and to San Francisco and into Montana in the North leaving us isolated as we were when we first came to this Territory. There is a power to do this and a disposition too," meaning the Knights of Labor.

A servant of God holding the power and keys of the holy Apostleship does not speak in this manner for mere pastime; there is more in these utterances than we are apt to attach unless we are aided by the Spirit of God. They are calculated to cheer the Saints in the time of trial and persecution.

The foregoing was declared at the time to be an accurate report of the remarks of Moses Thatcher in Cache county and as repeated by him at Rockville in Washington county, when he was on his way up from the South. Reports from these extreme points were to the same purport. But Brother Thatcher in his communication to President John Taylor, to which he refers in his latest open letter, disputes the correctness of that report, and gives the following as his own version of his remarks at Lewiston:

"The inaccuracy of the report consists mainly in accrediting me with declarations made by the Prophet Joseph Smith, and with statements recorded in his history as published in the *Millennial Star*, to which in my remarks I alluded, and from which I quoted. Of course I am unable to remember the exact words at the time and place mentioned, but I remember the ideas sought to be conveyed in that portion of my remarks claimed to have been reported as indicated in the prints sent me by you. In substance what I said was as follows:

"I believe that every Territorial, County and Municipal office in this Territory will be in the hands of our enemies before this religious persecution is ended; that we will be burdened by excessive taxation almost beyond human endurance; that political bondage will be so

complete and so oppressive, that we will be compelled to purify ourselves, cease to rely upon the arm of flesh, and cry night and day with one united voice of supplication to God, for deliverance. I believe, when that day shall come,—and I do not think it far distant,—the man like Moses spoken of in the Book of Covenants will lead the Saints out of bondage to the land of their inheritance, as predicted. There will be no hesitation, for what God does through that deliverer will be decisive and prompt. The mountains will tumble before him, and if trees or other obstructions be in the way of progress, they will be plucked up, or removed by the power of God, and "one shall chase a thousand and two shall put ten thousand to flight," as foretold.

It is my belief that the Saints will be delivered from bondage within five years, the Prophet Joseph Smith having declared at a special meeting of the members of Zion's Camp, called by revelation, manifest in vision to the Prophet and held at Kirtland, Ohio, on February 14th, 1835, "that the coming of the Lord was nigh,—even fifty-six years should wind up the scene." (Mill. Star, Vol. XV, page 205.)

The blessings of Moses to lead Israel in the latter days, even as Moses lead them in the days of old, having been put upon the head of Joseph by his anointed father, the ordained Patriarch of the Church. I believe the man to be "raised up," to deliver God's people from the temporal bondage will be no other than Joseph Smith, in the spirit or in the resurrected body." (Mill. Star, Vol. XV, page 620; also prediction in the Book of Mormon and Doctrine and Covenants.)

Within the time specified by the Prophet for the coming of the Lord and the winding up scene, I know not how great may be the destruction wrought upon our nation, but the officials thereof will cease their wickedness, corruptions and oppressions, repent of the hatred of the Almighty, and stop persecuting His saints, or the government and power to rule will pass out of their hands. Previous to the time indicated few cities in the Union will be beyond danger of disruption by the Knights of Labor and other secret societies, fast becoming formidable powers in the land. In the midst of the doings of these secret societies I should not be surprised, nor need you, dwelling in quiet Lewiston, be surprised, if within five years, the railroads between the Missouri River and San Francisco, Ogden and Montana on the North, are largely torn up, leaving us isolated as when we first came to the Territory. The power and disposition to accomplish this, and much more, is in these organizations, and will increase until the abundant elements of destruction, rapidly massing, will work for the people of our nation terrible disasters, and if they repent not, ultimate ruin."

How is it possible that Moses Thatcher can reconcile his own report of his utterances at Lewiston with his present statement that "not one word on the occasion referred partook of the nature of a prophecy as coming from him?" In his letter to President Taylor he states that the inaccuracy of the report consists mainly in attributing

to him assertions made by the Prophet Joseph Smith. But the citations which he makes, whether from the *Millennial Star* or the Doctrine and Covenants, make no allusion whatever to the events which he said would occur within five years from the time when he predicted them. They are not to be found in any of the declarations of the Prophet Joseph Smith, or of his father, or of any other leaders of the Church. If Moses Thatcher's utterances as reported by himself are not in the nature of predictions, then the term has no meaning in our language. If those predictions have not failed of fulfillment, then the history of our Church and nation since 1891 has no signification.

But reference to those predictions and their failure was not made in the nature of a "charge" against Moses Thatcher for which he was to be called to account, it was simply to show his lack of harmony with his associates in the Church, that being the gist of the offense alleged by the Church authorities.

But he urges in further excuse this peculiar assertion:

"Besides, it is well understood by the Saints that the sermons, even of Apostles, are not regarded as doctrine."

Let us compare this statement with the revelation of God through Joseph Smith to three Apostles, which the Lord declares is "an ensample unto all those who are ordained unto this Priesthood."

"And whatsoever they shall speak when moved upon by the Holy Ghost, shall be Scripture, shall be the will of the Lord, shall be the mind of the Lord, shall be the word of the Lord, shall be the voice of the Lord, and the power of God unto salvation." D. & C. p. 248.

This promise is to be coupled with the commandment,

"And the spirit shall be given unto you by the prayer of faith, and if ye receive not the spirit ye shall not teach." Doc. & Cov. page 170.

When we further consider the remark reported to have been made by Moses Thatcher at Lewiston, and which was a favorite expression of his at that time, his present declaration appears all the more remarkable. It was this:

"A servant of God holding the power and keys of the Holy Apostleship does not speak in this manner for mere pastime. There is more in these utterances than we are apt to attach unless we are aided by the Spirit of God."

He next disputes the statement of his discord with President Taylor in relation to the appointment of M. W. Merrill as President of the Logan Temple. But the spirit of forgetfulness which he attributes to others, must be an affliction of his own, for there is abundant evidence to prove the truth of President Snow's statement, and the fact of Moses Thatcher's appointment as third officer in the Temple, instead of proving, as he claims, that he had not opposed Brother Merrill's appointment, is rather in the nature of evidence that President Taylor desired to placate Moses Thatcher and soothe his ruffled feelings. But if the question was asked,did Moses Thatcher fill that appointment and perform its duties, what answer could be truthfully given? There is actually nothing to show that Brother Thatcher acted as assistant to the President of the Temple, even when his services were needed in consequence of the very large attendance for ordinance work. This was many years before his severe illness. It was in 1884.

The next effort of Moses Thatcher is to make it appear that there is a conflict between the position taken by the leading authorities of the Church on political matters previous to the admission of Utah into the Union, and that which they occupy now. That this effort is a complete failure will be evident to all who carfully examine that which he sets forth in support of his proposition. He quotes from the report of an interview with the First Presidency which appeared in the columns of the *Salt Lake Times*, and also refers to the statements of the First Presidency as published in the *Deseret News*. He then refers once more to the Declaration of Principles, and offers the excuse for not signing it, that he "could not reconcile this last one with those made by file leaders and ecclesiastical 'superiors between 1890 and the date of Utah's admission into the Union."

The truth is that there is nothing in all those utterances of the leaders of the Church, between the dates he mentions, which is in any way out of harmony with the principles enunciated in the Declaration, or "Manifesto," as he pleases to term it.

The substance of what he quotes from those earlier declarations is contained in these two paragraphs:

"We have no desire to interfere in these matters, but proclaim that, as far as we are concerned, the members of this Church are entirely and perfectly free in all political matters."

That is from the announcement made by the First Presidency March 18, 1892. The following is from the interview in the *Salt Lake Times*:

"Does the Church claim the right to dictate to its members in political matters?

The Church does not claim any such right.

That being true, are we to understand that the Church will not assert any right to control the political action of its members in the future?

That is what we wish to convey and have you understand."

Now what is there in those remarks, or in any others of a similar nature made by the Church leaders, which differs from their enunciation in the Declaration of Principles?

In that document the doctrine is reasserted, as a rule long established in the Church that,

"Every leading official thereof before accepting any position, political or otherwise, which would interfere with the proper and complete discharge of his ecclesiastical duties, and before accepting a nomination or entering into engagements to perform new duties, should apply to the proper authorities and learn from them whether he can consistently with the obligations already entered into with the Church upon assuming his office, take upon himself the added duties and labors and responsibilities of the new position."

It will be seen that this regulation, essential to maintain proper discipline and order in the Church, does not affect any one but the leading officials thereof. Following is another quotation from that document:

"We declare that in making these requirements of ourselves and our brethren in the ministry we do not in the least desire to dictate to them concerning their duties as American citizens, or to interfere with the affairs of the State. Neither do we consider that in the remotest degree we are seeking the union of Church and State."

The whole tenor and spirit of the Declaration tend to maintain the individual liberty, political and otherwise, of the members of the Church. There is nothing in it encroaching upon their rights as American citizens or seeking to control their ballots. They are left perfectly free to join or not to join any political party. The *Times* interview and the Declaration are in nowise antagonistic.

It is noticeable that in all the allusions to the Declaration made by Moses Thatcher, in his forced constructions of its language, in his inferences and deductions as to its meaning, he refrains from quoting a solitary sentence from that document, although it forms the chief topic of his lengthy efforts. If he found so vital a difference between former utterances of the Presidency and the principle advanced in

what he terms the "Manifesto," why did he quote in detail from the former and omit to quote a line from the latter. To use his own query, was this "the result of accident or design"?

Moses Thatcher assumes that the Declaration contains something that could be applied to restrict the liberties of the people, and argues that because of that danger he cannot sustain it. Is anything necessary further than this to show that he is and has been since April, 1896, entirely out of harmony with the authorities of the Church?

Here is another quotation from his letter:

"The spirit of the Manifesto as it appeared to me, was in violent antagonism to all I had believed and publicly proclaimed for many years, and I could not, and so far have not been able to bring myself to a point where I believe I should yield my political judgment to any set of men however praiseworthy their intentions."

Does he not in that paragraph furnish the proof that he has been for many years out of harmony with his brethren? But does the Declaration require him or any one else to "yield his political judgment?" The rule to which he objects, bears no such signification. An officer of the Church whose time and talents are pledged primarily to the Church, has no right under this rule to engage in anything, political or otherwise, which would take him away from the duties that claim his first attention, unless by permission of his associates and presiding officers. This does not infringe upon his political liberty or deprive him of his political judgment. If he prefers political honors to ecclesiastical duties, he can lay down the latter and freely take up the former. But he cannot at will ignore, neglect and forsake his Church duties for any purpose, and retain his official standing, power and authority. That is so simple a proposition that it would seem as though any person of mature age and sound mind could grasp it without difficulty.

But he contends:

"The Manifesto (applied as its construction will allow, or as it would be interpreted by men whose personal ambitions might control and subvert their sense of right) could be operated to the injury of the State."

Could not this be said of any declaration of principles or set of rules in Church or State penned by the hand of man? Does Moses Thatcher wish it to be understood that he charges any of the Church authorities with personal ambition or desire to establish what he

terms "absolutism?" If not, what is the meaning of his comment, last quoted on this subject? And yet he afterwards declares:

" eny their right or their intention to interfere with my politics."

If he disclaims their intention to interfere with his politics, why does he take the pains to deny their right, and where is the danger to the individual or to the State which appears to him so terrible? And he seems to be entirely oblivious to the danger which would come to the Church if its leading officials could go off as they pleased, hither or thither, engage in business or politics, accept public positions which would take them away months at a time from their ecclesiastical duties, without leave or license from the presiding Church authorities. He is fearful of some danger to the State from the operation of the rule asserted in the Declaration, but has no regard for the ruin that might ensue if that proper discipline declared to be essential to the order of the Church should not be maintained.

Nearly all of the remaining part of Moses Thatcher's letter is devoted to a presentation of his claims as a candidate for political office. It is entirely irrelevant to the subject discussed in President Snow's letter, to which the Thatcher communication purports to be a reply. He prefaces it with the following statement:

"My whole life and its work contradict the charge that I could seek office on a platform antagonistic to any Church. I should oppose any man who stood upon such a platform."

To test the sincerity of this assertion, it will be necessary to quote from the definition of his position in the Senatorial contest, published in the Salt Lake *Tribune* of Sunday morning Nov. 15th, and which he subsequently admitted to a *Herald* reporter was substantially correct. He said:

"If I had not been placed in a position involving a great principle, I could not be tempted to accept even the high office of United States Senator, but if Utah—if Young Utah feels that my election would be a vindication of that for which I have contended, and would aid in preventing the forging of chains upon the people of this State, I should accept the office of Senator should it be tendered me."

Then speaking of the Declaration of Principles he adds:

"I could not consent to the adoption of a rule that would affect

the political liberty of so many people, and give so great power to the Church authorities."

And further, he says:

"Because of the stand I then took I have been placed in the position of defending the cause imperilled by the Address I refused to sign, and I have been asked to believe that my election to the Senate at this time would be of incalculable benefit to that cause. If, as I have said, young Utah believes that it would, I shall be at its command, and shall be willing to give such service to the State in Congress as I am capable of rendering."

That forms the entire platform on which he then presented himself as a candidate for the high office of United States Senator. Is it not "a platform antagonistic to the Church" of which he was and now claims to be a member? He declared himself willing to accept a public position, for the express purpose of fighting a rule of that Church which its general and local authorities and the body of the Church had formally announced and adopted as essential to its order and discipline. On his own declaration, then, it will be entirely proper for every person in the Church who accepts the Declaration, to oppose Moses Thatcher in his political candidacy, because he stands on that anti-Church platform.

Observe, this is the logical deduction from his own reasoning. It is he who has interjected this political question into the subject of his religious relations and standing. It is he who has laid down the rule that any man should be opposed by the Church who seeks office on a platform antagonistic to its rules. While he pretends aversion to the idea of seeking office on such a platform, the whole tenor of his recent utterances given to the press tends to show that his aim and object are, to reach a high political position as the champion of a cause which is nothing if not hostile to the Church. And this appears to be the capstone of the somewhat incongruous structure which he has raised, under cover of a purported reply to the plain and pointed explanations given by President Snow, of the reasons why action was taken against him by the Council of the Twelve Apostles.

In reference to his candidacy for the Senatorship he exclaims:

"I invite neither the support nor the opposition of the Church. It has no concern in political issues."

That the opposition of the Church is incited if not "invited" by

his attitude of hostility to its latest official Declaration, cannot be rationally disputed. The Church has the right to protect itself, and when a candidate for high public office takes his stand upon a platform of open antagonism to its discipline, he virtually invites the opposition which he attempts to evade.

And is it true that "the Church has no concern in political issues?" Has not every Church in the United States some concern in political issues? In particular has not the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints deep concern in all political issues that affect the people of Utah? The great majority of them are members of that Church, and their welfare depends largely upon political issues.

The idea that the Church must be stricken dumb when political issues which have a direct bearing upon it are raised, is a fallacy that would be dangerous indeed if it were not so absurd.

As to the selection of persons for public office, the word of the Lord by revelation is given to the Church, and His people are directed by commandment to seek diligently for wise men and honest men, and are cautioned that the choice of other than good men and wise men "cometh of evil."

Every official in the Church has the right to express his views on political issues. The Church itself, as a body, is interested in those issues that concern the State and the Nation. Its officers have as much right as other men to a preference for some candidates over others for civil office. They may exercise their influence as citizens to give that preference effect, providing they do not use any improper means to accomplish it.

The opinions of men who helped to lay the foundations of this State, ought not to be ignored in political issues because they hold leading positions in the Church, and as the Church itself is almost entirely composed of people who are citizens, it is not to be shut out of a voice in public affairs by the bald assertion that "It has no concern in political issues." The Church must not dominate the State nor interfere with its functions; nor must the Church be robbed of its right to speak on issues that vitally concern its own welfare.

In conclusion Moses Thatcher admits that he has "no complaint against the treatment accorded" him, but asks:

"Why am I to be driven out of the Church because of the Manifesto?"

That admission is astonishing after the long columns of complaints

which precede it. That question is absurd in the absence of any attempt or desire to "drive him out of the Church." No man is "driven" out of the Church. It is his own acts that are responsible for any man's excommunication. Moses Thatcher, by simply going from his house in this city to the Historian's Office, a distance of two and a half blocks, to meet with the Council of the Apostles could have saved himself all the sorrow, grief and humiliation of which he so repeatedly complains, while claiming that he makes no complaint. By conversing with his brethren at a meeting specially convened at his written request, he could have learned all he wished to know respecting their views and feelings concerning him, and if he so desired could have made reconciliation, or have resigned peaceably the position which he could not consistently retain while out of harmony with that body. But, after asking for that meeting, when it had convened according to his desire he coolly informed his brethren that "they need not convene." When they re-convened a week later, he again failed to appear. He has indeed no cause to "complain of the treatment accorded" to him, nor has he any reason to talk of an attempt to "drive" him from the Church.

This review of Moses Thatcher's case is published with no desire to injure him in person, standing or estate. It is designed simply to guard members of the Church, who may be excited to undue sympathy by reason of pathetic appeals to their feelings, against being led away by a false light, by sophistical argument, or by political bias into the swamps of error which lead to the depths of apostacy, wherein are sorrow, ignominy, darkness and despair. By clinging to the "iron rod" and keeping their eyes fixed upon the guides whom God Almighty, through His son Jesus Christ, has set in the Church to point the way to celestial glory, they will be led in the strait and narrow way which leadeth unto eternal lives, avoiding the by and forbidden paths into which so many have strayed, and will thus gain an abundant entrance into the Eternal Presence, and receive the crown which awaits those who, having overcome all things, shall inherit all things.

his attitude of hostility to its latest official Declaration, cannot be rationally disputed. The Church has the right to protect itself, and when a candidate for high public office takes his stand upon a platform of open antagonism to its discipline, he virtually invites the opposition which he attempts to evade.

And is it true that "the Church has no concern in political issues?" Has not every Church in the United States some concern in political issues? In particular has not the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints deep concern in all political issues that affect the people of Utah? The great majority of them are members of that Church, and their welfare depends largely upon political issues.

The idea that the Church must be stricken dumb when political issues which have a direct bearing upon it are raised, is a fallacy that would be dangerous indeed if it were not so absurd.

As to the selection of persons for public office, the word of the Lord by revelation is given to the Church, and His people are directed by commandment to seek diligently for wise men and honest men, and are cautioned that the choice of other than good men and wise men "cometh of evil."

Every official in the Church has the right to express his views on political issues. The Church itself, as a body, is interested in those issues that concern the State and the Nation. Its officers have as much right as other men to a preference for some candidates over others for civil office. They may exercise their influence as citizens to give that preference effect, providing they do not use any improper means to accomplish it.

The opinions of men who helped to lay the foundations of this State, ought not to be ignored in political issues because they hold leading positions in the Church, and as the Church itself is almost entirely composed of people who are citizens, it is not to be shut out of a voice in public affairs by the bald assertion that "It has no concern in political issues." The Church must not dominate the State nor interfere with its functions; nor must the Church be robbed of its right to speak on issues that vitally concern its own welfare.

In conclusion Moses Thatcher admits that he has "no complaint against the treatment accorded" him, but asks:

"Why am I to be driven out of the Church because of the Manifesto?"

That admission is astonishing after the long columns of complaints

which precede it. That question is absurd in the absence of any attempt or desire to "drive him out of the Church." No man is "driven" out of the Church. It is his own acts that are responsible for any man's excommunication. Moses Thatcher, by simply going from his house in this city to the Historian's Office, a distance of two and a half blocks, to meet with the Council of the Apostles could have saved himself all the sorrow, grief and humiliation of which he so repeatedly complains, while claiming that he makes no complaint. By conversing with his brethren at a meeting specially convened at his written request, he could have learned all he wished to know respecting their views and feelings concerning him, and if he so desired could have made reconciliation, or have resigned peaceably the position which he could not consistently retain while out of harmony with that body. But, after asking for that meeting, when it had convened according to his desire he coolly informed his brethren that "they need not convene." When they re-convened a week later, he again failed to appear. He has indeed no cause to "complain of the treatment accorded" to him, nor has he any reason to talk of an attempt to "drive" him from the Church.

This review of Moses Thatcher's case is published with no desire to injure him in person, standing or estate. It is designed simply to guard members of the Church, who may be excited to undue sympathy by reason of pathetic appeals to their feelings, against being led away by a false light, by sophistical argument, or by political bias into the swamps of error which lead to the depths of apostacy, wherein are sorrow, ignominy, darkness and despair. By clinging to the "iron rod" and keeping their eyes fixed upon the guides whom God Almighty, through His son Jesus Christ, has set in the Church to point the way to celestial glory, they will be led in the strait and narrow way which leadeth unto eternal lives, avoiding the by and forbidden paths into which so many have strayed, and will thus gain an abundant entrance into the Eternal Presence, and receive the crown which awaits those who, having overcome all things, shall inherit all things.

his attitude of hostility to its latest official Declaration, cannot be rationally disputed. The Church has the right to protect itself, and when a candidate for high public office takes his stand upon a platform of open antagonism to its discipline, he virtually invites the opposition which he attempts to evade.

And is it true that "the Church has no concern in political issues?" Has not every Church in the United States some concern in political issues? In particular has not the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints deep concern in all political issues that affect the people of Utah? The great majority of them are members of that Church, and their welfare depends largely upon political issues.

The idea that the Church must be stricken dumb when political issues which have a direct bearing upon it are raised, is a fallacy that would be dangerous indeed if it were not so absurd.

As to the selection of persons for public office, the word of the Lord by revelation is given to the Church, and His people are directed by commandment to seek diligently for wise men and honest men, and are cautioned that the choice of other than good men and wise men "cometh of evil."

Every official in the Church has the right to express his views on political issues. The Church itself, as a body, is interested in those issues that concern the State and the Nation. Its officers have as much right as other men to a preference for some candidates over others for civil office. They may exercise their influence as citizens to give that preference effect, providing they do not use any improper means to accomplish it.

The opinions of men who helped to lay the foundations of this State, ought not to be ignored in political issues because they hold leading positions in the Church, and as the Church itself is almost entirely composed of people who are citizens, it is not to be shut out of a voice in public affairs by the bald assertion that "It has no concern in political issues." The Church must not dominate the State nor interfere with its functions; nor must the Church be robbed of its right to speak on issues that vitally concern its own welfare.

In conclusion Moses Thatcher admits that he has "no complaint against the treatment accorded" him, but asks:

"Why am I to be driven out of the Church because of the Manifesto?"

That admission is astonishing after the long columns of complaints

which precede it. That question is absurd in the absence of any attempt or desire to "drive him out of the Church." No man is "driven" out of the Church. It is his own acts that are responsible for any man's excommunication. Moses Thatcher, by simply going from his house in this city to the Historian's Office, a distance of two and a half blocks, to meet with the Council of the Apostles could have saved himself all the sorrow, grief and humiliation of which he so repeatedly complains, while claiming that he makes no complaint. By conversing with his brethren at a meeting specially convened at his written request, he could have learned all he wished to know respecting their views and feelings concerning him, and if he so desired could have made reconciliation, or have resigned peaceably the position which he could not consistently retain while out of harmony with that body. But, after asking for that meeting, when it had convened according to his desire he coolly informed his brethren that "they need not convene." When they re-convened a week later, he again failed to appear. He has indeed no cause to "complain of the treatment accorded" to him, nor has he any reason to talk of an attempt to "drive" him from the Church.

This review of Moses Thatcher's case is published with no desire to injure him in person, standing or estate. It is designed simply to guard members of the Church, who may be excited to undue sympathy by reason of pathetic appeals to their feelings, against being led away by a false light, by sophistical argument, or by political bias into the swamps of error which lead to the depths of apostacy, wherein are sorrow, ignominy, darkness and despair. By clinging to the "iron rod" and keeping their eyes fixed upon the guides whom God Almighty, through His son Jesus Christ, has set in the Church to point the way to celestial glory, they will be led in the strait and narrow way which leadeth unto eternal lives, avoiding the by and forbidden paths into which so many have strayed, and will thus gain an abundant entrance into the Eternal Presence, and receive the crown which awaits those who, having overcome all things, shall inherit all things.

his attitude of hostility to its latest official Declaration, cannot be rationally disputed. The Church has the right to protect itself, and when a candidate for high public office takes his stand upon a platform of open antagonism to its discipline, he virtually invites the opposition which he attempts to evade.

And is it true that "the Church has no concern in political issues?" Has not every Church in the United States some concern in political issues? In particular has not the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints deep concern in all political issues that affect the people of Utah? The great majority of them are members of that Church, and their welfare depends largely upon political issues.

The idea that the Church must be stricken dumb when political issues which have a direct bearing upon it are raised, is a fallacy that would be dangerous indeed if it were not so absurd.

As to the selection of persons for public office, the word of the Lord by revelation is given to the Church, and His people are directed by commandment to seek diligently for wise men and honest men, and are cautioned that the choice of other than good men and wise men "cometh of evil."

Every official in the Church has the right to express his views on political issues. The Church itself, as a body, is interested in those issues that concern the State and the Nation. Its officers have as much right as other men to a preference for some candidates over others for civil office. They may exercise their influence as citizens to give that preference effect, providing they do not use any improper means to accomplish it.

The opinions of men who helped to lay the foundations of this State, ought not to be ignored in political issues because they hold leading positions in the Church, and as the Church itself is almost entirely composed of people who are citizens, it is not to be shut out of a voice in public affairs by the bald assertion that "It has no concern in political issues." The Church must not dominate the State nor interfere with its functions; nor must the Church be robbed of its right to speak on issues that vitally concern its own welfare.

In conclusion Moses Thatcher admits that he has "no complaint against the treatment accorded" him, but asks:

"Why am I to be driven out of the Church because of the Manifesto?"

That admission is astonishing after the long columns of complaints

which precede it. That question is absurd in the absence of any attempt or desire to "drive him out of the Church." No man is "driven" out of the Church. It is his own acts that are responsible for any man's excommunication. Moses Thatcher, by simply going from his house in this city to the Historian's Office, a distance of two and a half blocks, to meet with the Council of the Apostles could have saved himself all the sorrow, grief and humiliation of which he so repeatedly complains, while claiming that he makes no complaint. By conversing with his brethren at a meeting specially convened at his written request, he could have learned all he wished to know respecting their views and feelings concerning him, and if he so desired could have made reconciliation, or have resigned peaceably the position which he could not consistently retain while out of harmony with that body. But, after asking for that meeting, when it had convened according to his desire he coolly informed his brethren that "they need not convene." When they re-convened a week later, he again failed to appear. He has indeed no cause to "complain of the treatment accorded" to him, nor has he any reason to talk of an attempt to "drive" him from the Church.

This review of Moses Thatcher's case is published with no desire to injure him in person, standing or estate. It is designed simply to guard members of the Church, who may be excited to undue sympathy by reason of pathetic appeals to their feelings, against being led away by a false light, by sophistical argument, or by political bias into the swamps of error which lead to the depths of apostacy, wherein are sorrow, ignominy, darkness and despair. By clinging to the "iron rod" and keeping their eyes fixed upon the guides whom God Almighty, through His son Jesus Christ, has set in the Church to point the way to celestial glory, they will be led in the strait and narrow way which leadeth unto eternal lives, avoiding the by and forbidden paths into which so many have strayed, and will thus gain an abundant entrance into the Eternal Presence, and receive the crown which awaits those who, having overcome all things, shall inherit all things.

his attitude of hostility to its latest official Declaration, cannot be rationally disputed. The Church has the right to protect itself, and when a candidate for high public office takes his stand upon a platform of open antagonism to its discipline, he virtually invites the opposition which he attempts to evade.

And is it true that "the Church has no concern in political issues?" Has not every Church in the United States some concern in political issues? In particular has not the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints deep concern in all political issues that affect the people of Utah? The great majority of them are members of that Church, and their welfare depends largely upon political issues.

The idea that the Church must be stricken dumb when political issues which have a direct bearing upon it are raised, is a fallacy that would be dangerous indeed if it were not so absurd.

As to the selection of persons for public office, the word of the Lord by revelation is given to the Church, and His people are directed by commandment to seek diligently for wise men and honest men, and are cautioned that the choice of other than good men and wise men "cometh of evil."

Every official in the Church has the right to express his views on political issues. The Church itself, as a body, is interested in those issues that concern the State and the Nation. Its officers have as much right as other men to a preference for some candidates over others for civil office. They may exercise their influence as citizens to give that preference effect, providing they do not use any improper means to accomplish it.

The opinions of men who helped to lay the foundations of this State, ought not to be ignored in political issues because they hold leading positions in the Church, and as the Church itself is almost entirely composed of people who are citizens, it is not to be shut out of a voice in public affairs by the bald assertion that "It has no concern in political issues." The Church must not dominate the State nor interfere with its functions; nor must the Church be robbed of its right to speak on issues that vitally concern its own welfare.

In conclusion Moses Thatcher admits that he has "no complaint against the treatment accorded" him, but asks:

"Why am I to be driven out of the Church because of the Manifesto?"

That admission is astonishing after the long columns of complaints

which precede it. That question is absurd in the absence of any attempt or desire to "drive him out of the Church." No man is "driven" out of the Church. It is his own acts that are responsible for any man's excommunication. Moses Thatcher, by simply going from his house in this city to the Historian's Office, a distance of two and a half blocks, to meet with the Council of the Apostles could have saved himself all the sorrow, grief and humiliation of which he so repeatedly complains, while claiming that he makes no complaint. By conversing with his brethren at a meeting specially convened at his written request, he could have learned all he wished to know respecting their views and feelings concerning him, and if he so desired could have made reconciliation, or have resigned peaceably the position which he could not consistently retain while out of harmony with that body. But, after asking for that meeting, when it had convened according to his desire he coolly informed his brethren that "they need not convene." When they re-convened a week later, he again failed to appear. He has indeed no cause to "complain of the treatment accorded" to him, nor has he any reason to talk of an attempt to "drive" him from the Church.

This review of Moses Thatcher's case is published with no desire to injure him in person, standing or estate. It is designed simply to guard members of the Church, who may be excited to undue sympathy by reason of pathetic appeals to their feelings, against being led away by a false light, by sophistical argument, or by political bias into the swamps of error which lead to the depths of apostacy, wherein are sorrow, ignominy, darkness and despair. By clinging to the "iron rod" and keeping their eyes fixed upon the guides whom God Almighty, through His son Jesus Christ, has set in the Church to point the way to celestial glory, they will be led in the strait and narrow way which leadeth unto eternal lives, avoiding the by and forbidden paths into which so many have strayed, and will thus gain an abundant entrance into the Eternal Presence, and receive the crown which awaits those who, having overcome all things, shall inherit all things.

his attitude of hostility to its latest official Declaration, cannot be rationally disputed. The Church has the right to protect itself, and when a candidate for high public office takes his stand upon a platform of open antagonism to its discipline, he virtually invites the opposition which he attempts to evade.

And is it true that "the Church has no concern in political issues?" Has not every Church in the United States some concern in political issues? In particular has not the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints deep concern in all political issues that affect the people of Utah? The great majority of them are members of that Church, and their welfare depends largely upon political issues.

The idea that the Church must be stricken dumb when political issues which have a direct bearing upon it are raised, is a fallacy that would be dangerous indeed if it were not so absurd.

As to the selection of persons for public office, the word of the Lord by revelation is given to the Church, and His people are directed by commandment to seek diligently for wise men and honest men, and are cautioned that the choice of other than good men and wise men "cometh of evil."

Every official in the Church has the right to express his views on political issues. The Church itself, as a body, is interested in those issues that concern the State and the Nation. Its officers have as much right as other men to a preference for some candidates over others for civil office. They may exercise their influence as citizens to give that preference effect, providing they do not use any improper means to accomplish it.

The opinions of men who helped to lay the foundations of this State, ought not to be ignored in political issues because they hold leading positions in the Church, and as the Church itself is almost entirely composed of people who are citizens, it is not to be shut out of a voice in public affairs by the bald assertion that "It has no concern in political issues." The Church must not dominate the State nor interfere with its functions; nor must the Church be robbed of its right to speak on issues that vitally concern its own welfare.

In conclusion Moses Thatcher admits that he has "no complaint against the treatment accorded" him, but asks:

"Why am I to be driven out of the Church because of the Manifesto?"

That admission is astonishing after the long columns of complaints

which precede it. That question is absurd in the absence of any attempt or desire to "drive him out of the Church." No man is "driven" out of the Church. It is his own acts that are responsible for any man's excommunication. Moses Thatcher, by simply going from his house in this city to the Historian's Office, a distance of two and a half blocks, to meet with the Council of the Apostles could have saved himself all the sorrow, grief and humiliation of which he so repeatedly complains, while claiming that he makes no complaint. By conversing with his brethren at a meeting specially convened at his written request, he could have learned all he wished to know respecting their views and feelings concerning him, and if he so desired could have made reconciliation, or have resigned peaceably the position which he could not consistently retain while out of harmony with that body. But, after asking for that meeting, when it had convened according to his desire he coolly informed his brethren that "they need not convene." When they re-convened a week later, he again failed to appear. He has indeed no cause to "complain of the treatment accorded" to him, nor has he any reason to talk of an attempt to "drive" him from the Church.

This review of Moses Thatcher's case is published with no desire to injure him in person, standing or estate. It is designed simply to guard members of the Church, who may be excited to undue sympathy by reason of pathetic appeals to their feelings, against being led away by a false light, by sophistical argument, or by political bias into the swamps of error which lead to the depths of apostacy, wherein are sorrow, ignominy, darkness and despair. By clinging to the "iron rod" and keeping their eyes fixed upon the guides whom God Almighty, through His son Jesus Christ, has set in the Church to point the way to celestial glory, they will be led in the strait and narrow way which leadeth unto eternal lives, avoiding the by and forbidden paths into which so many have strayed, and will thus gain an abundant entrance into the Eternal Presence, and receive the crown which awaits those who, having overcome all things, shall inherit all things.

his attitude of hostility to its latest official Declaration, cannot be rationally disputed. The Church has the right to protect itself, and when a candidate for high public office takes his stand upon a platform of open antagonism to its discipline, he virtually invites the opposition which he attempts to evade.

And is it true that "the Church has no concern in political issues?" Has not every Church in the United States some concern in political issues? In particular has not the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints deep concern in all political issues that affect the people of Utah? The great majority of them are members of that Church, and their welfare depends largely upon political issues.

The idea that the Church must be stricken dumb when political issues which have a direct bearing upon it are raised, is a fallacy that would be dangerous indeed if it were not so absurd.

As to the selection of persons for public office, the word of the Lord by revelation is given to the Church, and His people are directed by commandment to seek diligently for wise men and honest men, and are cautioned that the choice of other than good men and wise men "cometh of evil."

Every official in the Church has the right to express his views on political issues. The Church itself, as a body, is interested in those issues that concern the State and the Nation. Its officers have as much right as other men to a preference for some candidates over others for civil office. They may exercise their influence as citizens to give that preference effect, providing they do not use any improper means to accomplish it.

The opinions of men who helped to lay the foundations of this State, ought not to be ignored in political issues because they hold leading positions in the Church, and as the Church itself is almost entirely composed of people who are citizens, it is not to be shut out of a voice in public affairs by the bald assertion that "It has no concern in political issues." The Church must not dominate the State nor interfere with its functions; nor must the Church be robbed of its right to speak on issues that vitally concern its own welfare.

In conclusion Moses Thatcher admits that he has "no complaint against the treatment accorded" him, but asks:

"Why am I to be driven out of the Church because of the Manifesto?"

That admission is astonishing after the long columns of complaints

which precede it. That question is absurd in the absence of any attempt or desire to "drive him out of the Church." No man is "driven" out of the Church. It is his own acts that are responsible for any man's excommunication. Moses Thatcher, by simply going from his house in this city to the Historian's Office, a distance of two and a half blocks, to meet with the Council of the Apostles could have saved himself all the sorrow, grief and humiliation of which he so repeatedly complains, while claiming that he makes no complaint. By conversing with his brethren at a meeting specially convened at his written request, he could have learned all he wished to know respecting their views and feelings concerning him, and if he so desired could have made reconciliation, or have resigned peaceably the position which he could not consistently retain while out of harmony with that body. But, after asking for that meeting, when it had convened according to his desire he coolly informed his brethren that "they need not convene." When they re-convened a week later, he again failed to appear. He has indeed no cause to "complain of the treatment accorded" to him, nor has he any reason to talk of an attempt to "drive" him from the Church.

This review of Moses Thatcher's case is published with no desire to injure him in person, standing or estate. It is designed simply to guard members of the Church, who may be excited to undue sympathy by reason of pathetic appeals to their feelings, against being led away by a false light, by sophistical argument, or by political bias into the swamps of error which lead to the depths of apostacy, wherein are sorrow, ignominy, darkness and despair. By clinging to the "iron rod" and keeping their eyes fixed upon the guides whom God Almighty, through His son Jesus Christ, has set in the Church to point the way to celestial glory, they will be led in the strait and narrow way which leadeth unto eternal lives, avoiding the by and forbidden paths into which so many have strayed, and will thus gain an abundant entrance into the Eternal Presence, and receive the crown which awaits those who, having overcome all things, shall inherit all things.

his attitude of hostility to its latest official Declaration, cannot be rationally disputed. The Church has the right to protect itself, and when a candidate for high public office takes his stand upon a platform of open antagonism to its discipline, he virtually invites the opposition which he attempts to evade.

And is it true that "the Church has no concern in political issues?" Has not every Church in the United States some concern in political issues? In particular has not the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints deep concern in all political issues that affect the people of Utah? The great majority of them are members of that Church, and their welfare depends largely upon political issues.

The idea that the Church must be stricken dumb when political issues which have a direct bearing upon it are raised, is a fallacy that would be dangerous indeed if it were not so absurd.

As to the selection of persons for public office, the word of the Lord by revelation is given to the Church, and His people are directed by commandment to seek diligently for wise men and honest men, and are cautioned that the choice of other than good men and wise men "cometh of evil."

Every official in the Church has the right to express his views on political issues. The Church itself, as a body, is interested in those issues that concern the State and the Nation. Its officers have as much right as other men to a preference for some candidates over others for civil office. They may exercise their influence as citizens to give that preference effect, providing they do not use any improper means to accomplish it.

The opinions of men who helped to lay the foundations of this State, ought not to be ignored in political issues because they hold leading positions in the Church, and as the Church itself is almost entirely composed of people who are citizens, it is not to be shut out of a voice in public affairs by the bald assertion that "It has no concern in political issues." The Church must not dominate the State nor interfere with its functions; nor must the Church be robbed of its right to speak on issues that vitally concern its own welfare.

In conclusion Moses Thatcher admits that he has "no complaint against the treatment accorded" him, but asks:

"Why am I to be driven out of the Church because of the Manifesto?"

That admission is astonishing after the long columns of complaints

which precede it. That question is absurd in the absence of any attempt or desire to "drive him out of the Church." No man is "driven" out of the Church. It is his own acts that are responsible for any man's excommunication. Moses Thatcher, by simply going from his house in this city to the Historian's Office, a distance of two and a half blocks, to meet with the Council of the Apostles could have saved himself all the sorrow, grief and humiliation of which he so repeatedly complains, while claiming that he makes no complaint. By conversing with his brethren at a meeting specially convened at his written request, he could have learned all he wished to know respecting their views and feelings concerning him, and if he so desired could have made reconciliation, or have resigned peaceably the position which he could not consistently retain while out of harmony with that body. But, after asking for that meeting, when it had convened according to his desire he coolly informed his brethren that "they need not convene." When they re-convened a week later, he again failed to appear. He has indeed no cause to "complain of the treatment accorded" to him, nor has he any reason to talk of an attempt to "drive" him from the Church.

This review of Moses Thatcher's case is published with no desire to injure him in person, standing or estate. It is designed simply to guard members of the Church, who may be excited to undue sympathy by reason of pathetic appeals to their feelings, against being led away by a false light, by sophistical argument, or by political bias into the swamps of error which lead to the depths of apostacy, wherein are sorrow, ignominy, darkness and despair. By clinging to the "iron rod" and keeping their eyes fixed upon the guides whom God Almighty, through His son Jesus Christ, has set in the Church to point the way to celestial glory, they will be led in the strait and narrow way which leadeth unto eternal lives, avoiding the by and forbidden paths into which so many have strayed, and will thus gain an abundant entrance into the Eternal Presence, and receive the crown which awaits those who, having overcome all things, shall inherit all things.